

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

LOUISIANA



**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:

Louisiana Department of Education

Address:

1201 N. Third Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Dr. Bonnie Boulton

Telephone: 225-342-3513

Fax: 225-219-7370

e-mail: Bonnie.Boulton@la.gov

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

Susan Batson

Friday, March 19, 2010, 2:23:24 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

In 2009, Louisiana initiated the process of standards revision in four content areas, mathematics, reading/language arts, science and social studies. The process was halted when the Common Core Standards, scheduled to be developed and approved in early 2010, became an option for states to adopt. Louisiana will review and adopt the Common Core Standards in reading and mathematics (Pre-K through grade 12) with the latitude of revising/supplementing them within the acceptable guidelines. Within the same timeframe, Louisiana will proceed with the revision of content standards for science and social studies. Once the standards are completed, Louisiana will develop grade level expectations (GLEs) based on the new/revised standards. The new standards and GLEs are scheduled to be implemented in 2011-2012.

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.

Louisiana will develop new state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics to reflect the new standards and grade level expectations (GLEs) in grades three through eleven. End-or-Course tests in these contents will replace the current Graduation Exit Examination as a graduation requirement. Louisiana currently has two alternate assessments that measure reading/language arts and mathematics. LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1) is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities and based on alternate achievement standards. LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2, (LAA 2) is designed for students with persistent academic disabilities and based on modified achievement standards. Grade level standards serve as the foundation for the general assessments and the alternate assessments. The general and alternate assessments will be developed or revised to reflect the new/ revised state content standards. Louisiana does not produce native language assessments. Tentatively, new state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics will be field tested in 2012-2013 and implemented in 2013-2014.

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.

Louisiana currently assesses science at grades 4, 8, and 11 on the state general assessments and the alternate assessments (LAA 1 and LAA 2). Using new science standards as a basis, new science assessments for general and special education students will be developed to assess students once at each of the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Louisiana is currently developing an End-of-Course test in Biology to replace the Graduation Exit Exam in science. The Biology EOC test will be revised as needed to align with the new standards. Tentatively, new state assessments in science will be field tested in 2012-2013 and implemented in 2013-2014.
--

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	351,362		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,864		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,970		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	162,173		>97%
Hispanic	9,955		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	171,254		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	41,778		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,227		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	229,574		>97%
Migratory students	962		>97%
Male	179,587		>97%
Female	171,622		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,775	6.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,653	71.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,956	14.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,185	7.7
Total	41,569	
Comments: Louisiana does not offer an alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards.		

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	351,380		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,865		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,971		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	162,170		>97%
Hispanic	9,955		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	171,274		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	41,802		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,228		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	229,575		>97%
Migratory students	963		>97%
Male	179,596		>97%
Female	171,629		>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	2,783	6.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,659	71.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,992	14.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,197	7.7
Total	41,631	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	340,053		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,765		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,846		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	155,699		>97%
Hispanic	9,568		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	167,071		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	36,388		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,961		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	220,580		>97%
Migratory students	927		>97%
Male	172,808		>97%
Female	167,144		>97%
Comments: Data will be re-verified and EDEN files edited if necessary.			

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	3,038	8.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,412	79.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2,986	8.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,395	3.8
Total	36,831	
Comments: Louisiana does not offer an alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards. Students who are assessed with the alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards and alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards are tested in science at grades 4, 8 and 11. Students who participate in the regular assessment are tested in science at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11.		

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	54,216	36,968	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	451	315	69.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	722	611	84.6
Black, non-Hispanic	25,404	13,685	53.9
Hispanic	1,720	1,108	64.4
White, non-Hispanic	25,902	21,237	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,633	3,128	47.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,239	744	60.0
Economically disadvantaged students	37,738	22,847	60.5
Migratory students	154	97	63.0
Male	28,082	19,146	68.2
Female	26,103	17,807	68.2
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	54,214	36,004	66.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	452	310	68.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	722	586	81.2
Black, non-Hispanic	25,403	13,701	53.9
Hispanic	1,720	1,015	59.0
White, non-Hispanic	25,900	20,383	78.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,633	2,789	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,240	655	52.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37,740	22,161	58.7
Migratory students	154	92	59.7
Male	28,079	17,276	61.5
Female	26,104	18,717	71.7
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	53,739	33,364	62.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	447	305	68.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	716	565	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	25,147	11,353	45.2
Hispanic	1,706	1,008	59.1
White, non-Hispanic	25,706	20,123	78.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,225	2,800	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,235	661	53.5
Economically disadvantaged students	37,385	19,837	53.1
Migratory students	153	88	57.5
Male	27,768	17,237	62.1
Female	25,940	16,115	62.1
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	57,152	36,383	63.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	477	310	65.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	719	595	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	27,755	13,650	49.2
Hispanic	1,632	1,060	65.0
White, non-Hispanic	26,552	20,760	78.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,275	3,174	38.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,140	665	58.3
Economically disadvantaged students	40,359	22,458	55.6
Migratory students	188	112	59.6
Male	29,818	18,971	63.6
Female	27,318	17,405	63.7
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,157	40,296	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	477	354	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	719	591	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	27,759	16,841	60.7
Hispanic	1,632	1,103	67.6
White, non-Hispanic	26,554	21,398	80.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,278	3,134	37.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,140	652	57.2
Economically disadvantaged students	40,362	25,881	64.1
Migratory students	188	110	58.5
Male	29,823	19,652	65.9
Female	27,319	20,638	75.5
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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.

1.3.3.2 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	57,077	36,841	64.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	477	332	69.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	719	565	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	27,728	13,263	47.8
Hispanic	1,633	1,068	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	26,506	21,606	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,258	3,653	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,139	620	54.4
Economically disadvantaged students	40,305	22,604	56.1
Migratory students	188	105	55.8
Male	29,773	19,390	65.1
Female	27,288	17,444	63.9
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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.

1.3.1.3 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	48,941	31,783	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	421	288	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	672	575	85.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21,994	11,015	50.1
Hispanic	1,406	910	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	24,432	18,990	77.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,842	2,327	39.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	879	495	56.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,775	18,585	56.7
Migratory students	142	83	58.4
Male	24,969	16,471	66.0
Female	23,959	15,309	63.9
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,937	31,965	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	422	271	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	672	546	81.2
Black, non-Hispanic	21,991	12,001	54.6
Hispanic	1,406	833	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	24,430	18,306	74.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,842	2,049	35.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	879	377	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	32,772	18,923	57.7
Migratory students	142	76	53.5
Male	24,965	15,048	60.3
Female	23,959	16,912	70.6
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	47,550	29,405	61.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	283	69.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	663	520	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,164	9,200	43.5
Hispanic	1,385	839	60.6
White, non-Hispanic	23,913	18,557	77.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,503	1,856	41.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	866	400	46.2
Economically disadvantaged students	31,658	16,462	52.0
Migratory students	140	75	53.6
Male	24,044	15,422	64.1
Female	23,494	13,980	59.5
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	47,627	33,017	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	404	296	73.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	690	582	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,500	12,025	55.9
Hispanic	1,432	883	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,577	19,219	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,315	2,017	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	859	418	48.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31,285	19,255	61.6
Migratory students	148	91	61.5
Male	24,487	16,736	68.4
Female	23,122	16,272	70.4
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47,626	32,072	67.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	404	295	73.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	690	554	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21,501	11,760	54.7
Hispanic	1,432	824	57.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,575	18,625	79.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,318	1,842	34.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	859	321	37.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31,284	18,479	59.1
Migratory students	149	82	55.0
Male	24,483	15,135	61.8
Female	23,125	16,927	73.2
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	46,220	28,415	61.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	394	255	64.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	683	520	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20,622	9,279	45.0
Hispanic	1,413	793	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	23,087	17,559	76.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,996	1,433	35.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	841	320	38.0
Economically disadvantaged students	30,105	15,598	51.8
Migratory students	145	81	55.9
Male	23,540	14,462	61.4
Female	22,662	13,947	61.5
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	50,517	31,273	61.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	447	283	63.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	708	611	86.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,278	10,737	46.1
Hispanic	1,318	794	60.2
White, non-Hispanic	24,735	18,830	76.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,354	1,992	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	843	434	51.5
Economically disadvantaged students	32,828	17,342	52.8
Migratory students	143	80	55.9
Male	26,098	16,097	61.7
Female	24,392	15,165	62.2
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,507	31,013	61.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	446	296	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	708	563	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23,277	10,936	47.0
Hispanic	1,318	769	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	24,729	18,436	74.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,361	1,732	27.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	843	350	41.5
Economically disadvantaged students	32,819	17,070	52.0
Migratory students	144	72	50.0
Male	26,093	14,532	55.7
Female	24,388	16,469	67.5
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	48,867	28,649	58.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	440	279	63.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	696	563	80.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22,224	9,258	41.7
Hispanic	1,296	756	58.3
White, non-Hispanic	24,184	17,783	73.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,824	1,331	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	830	365	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31,467	15,288	48.6
Migratory students	136	71	52.2
Male	24,951	14,332	57.4
Female	23,893	14,308	59.9
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	51,605	29,775	57.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	366	221	60.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	695	573	82.4
Black, non-Hispanic	24,780	10,041	40.5
Hispanic	1,309	816	62.3
White, non-Hispanic	24,430	18,118	74.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,408	1,543	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	702	344	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,050	15,650	47.4
Migratory students	115	60	52.2
Male	26,206	15,409	58.8
Female	25,369	14,357	56.6
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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.

1.3.2.6 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	51,669	31,691	61.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	251	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	695	528	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	24,828	11,622	46.8
Hispanic	1,309	782	59.7
White, non-Hispanic	24,445	18,503	75.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,435	1,499	23.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	702	246	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,104	17,173	51.9
Migratory students	115	51	44.4
Male	26,252	14,503	55.2
Female	25,387	17,177	67.7
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	51,395	27,335	53.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	364	226	62.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	696	505	72.6
Black, non-Hispanic	24,639	7,992	32.4
Hispanic	1,304	716	54.9
White, non-Hispanic	24,371	17,892	73.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,349	1,597	25.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	699	244	34.9
Economically disadvantaged students	32,877	13,491	41.0
Migratory students	113	42	37.2
Male	26,075	14,392	55.2
Female	25,298	12,936	51.1
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	40,556	29,075	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	295	208	70.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	736	649	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	16,990	9,796	57.7
Hispanic	1,039	699	67.3
White, non-Hispanic	21,484	17,720	82.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,742	942	34.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	435	232	53.3
Economically disadvantaged students	20,954	13,214	63.1
Migratory students	61	38	62.3
Male	19,447	14,200	73.0
Female	21,094	14,869	70.5
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	40,594	24,969	61.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	294	186	63.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	737	526	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,004	8,204	48.2
Hispanic	1,037	566	54.6
White, non-Hispanic	21,511	15,485	72.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,764	815	29.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	434	122	28.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20,974	10,919	52.1
Migratory students	61	31	50.8
Male	19,474	10,635	54.6
Female	21,102	14,332	67.9
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,657	23,451	60.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	151	59.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	732	547	74.7
Black, non-Hispanic	16,184	6,403	39.6
Hispanic	966	575	59.5
White, non-Hispanic	20,511	15,769	76.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,676	793	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	380	144	37.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,943	8,899	47.0
Migratory students	60	30	50.0
Male	18,308	12,319	67.3
Female	20,335	11,124	54.7
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,246	1,131	90.8
Districts	114	50	43.9
Comments: Districts in Section 1.4.1 do not reflect the charter schools, which are treated as districts for funding purposes.			

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	1,059	957	90.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	865	780	90.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	194	177	91.2
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

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
114	49	43.0
Comments: The increase in the number of districts that received Title I Funds in 2008-09 is due to the addition of charter schools. In Louisiana, some charter schools are funded as Local Education Agencies.		

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	16
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	19
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	12
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	22
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)	10
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	10
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.

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.

There are no districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement at this time.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	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: No districts are in corrective action at this time.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: Appeals are due within 60 days of notification of failing. No districts have appealed AYP designations on a school's behalf. There are some data corrections remaining, but no status changes are predicted.		

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2008-09.

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

The table below pertains 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	15,289	29,605
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	6,038	5,191
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	39.5	17.5
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	15,293	29,605
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	6,024	5,325
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	39.4	18.0
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	39
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	18
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	12
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	Restructured the Master Schedule to incorporate intervention classes, after school tutoring, and employ instructional coaches.	13	6	4	A	GLE Benchmark test in math and ELA.
2		5			B	
3		2			C	
4		2			D	
5	1	1				
Comments: Data will be verified and edited as necessary.						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The School Improvement staff of Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) is currently making revisions to the school improvement training process. The LDE recently added Innovative Configuration Maps for each of the highlighted Best Practices/Strategies we share with districts and schools. These IC Maps will be part of the new training scheduled for Spring 2010. The LDE provided regular training opportunities for LEAs through the Regional Education Service Centers. Each region participates in intensive training that helps school support teams monitor and evaluate data derived from a comprehensive needs assessment and analysis system; that assists schools in creating and evaluating effective school improvement planning process; and that guides the LEAs with monitoring the implementation of the strategies outlined in the school's school improvement plan.

The State has entered into an agreement with each district. They have agreed to focus funding on the Louisiana Literacy Program: Ensuring Literacy for All and its professional development activities and consulting services for developing awareness, gaining buy-in, implementation, follow-up and follow-along, and evaluation; to direct spending to the School Improvement Plan, determined by the School Improvement Team, and based on individual school needs; to collect, enter, and analyze data through the existing web-based needs assessment tool; and collect data on the total number and percentage of students who are proficient in English/language arts and mathematics and report whether the number and percentage of students who are proficient has increased from the prior year as measured by LEAP, iLEAP, and GEE.

The State also provided professional development to administrators, school support team members, coaches, and teachers in the current research on the five essentials components of reading and the assessment of these areas. This built capacity within the LEAs to redeliver the information to their remaining schools. State and LEAs worked closely on professional development that focused on the importance of data driven instruction.

The State provided regular, component-specific professional development activities for participating Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) schools.

Technical assistance was given to districts by the state with follow-up visits based on targeted assistance.

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.

In accordance with our 1003(g) application agreements with LEAs and schools, Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) will strive to build capacity in current school improvement structures, to expand resources, and to support additional schools and districts in need. LDE will report the number of schools that receive technical assistance and Title I School Improvement Grant funds that make AYP and/or exit improvement status. Each school submitted quarterly reports on the use of 1003(g) and assessed the active performance of teachers in accordance with the school's identified strategies from the school improvement plan. The LDE will conducted on-site visits and used periodic surveys to gather information regarding the implementation of the school improvement activities. The Regional Education Service Center staff of the LDE provided technical support in the areas of Literacy and Numeracy and High School Redesign. The LDE renewed the district's grant for additional one-year periods, as funds were made available from USDOE. If the school does not make AYP, more aggressive and intensive efforts from the Department will be focused on the school in an effort to continue to provide assistance. New schools that fell into improvement during the 1003(g) cycle were included in the next year's list of recipients and provided the same agreements.

DIBELS Benchmark and Progress Monitoring along with DRA were used to evaluate students reading levels throughout the state. The LDE also contracts with an external evaluator, the Cecil Picard Center at the University of LA at Lafayette. Districts are provided technical assistance from LDE staff such as Regional Literacy Coordinators and Educational Program Consultants. Technical assistance consist of but is not limited to the following, data examination, small group instruction, core program support, coach support, as well as numerous professional development in areas such as classroom management, DIBELS testing, and LETRS Foundations.

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.

Reading First funds along with State Literacy & Numeracy funds were used to provide professional development for administrators, school support staff, coaches, and teachers in areas such as literacy, numeracy, data driven instruction, classroom management, small group instruction and differentiated instruction. These funds were also used to provide technical assistance to schools by regional literacy coordinators as well as state staff members.

The LDE offers a Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). The ultimate goal of the TAP is to strengthen teacher instructional capacity and increase student achievement. TAP is unique in that it is comprehensive in nature combining 4 key elements (multiple career paths, ongoing job-embedded professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance based compensation). All four elements implemented at the same time provide the right combination of high expectations, opportunity for growth, accountability and support for schools to do what is necessary to improve. When implemented according to the model, TAP counters many of the traditional drawbacks that plague the teaching profession: ineffective professional development, teacher isolation, lack of career advancement, unsupported accountability demands, and low, undifferentiated compensation.

Districts re-allocate existing district, state and Federal dollars: Title I (Part A, Section 1114 School-Wide Program), (Part A Set Aside), (Financial Incentives & Rewards); Title II (Part A Teacher Quality State Grant); Title V (Innovative Program); IDEA Part B (Early Intervening Services); K-3 Reading & Math Initiative (Allowable Expenses); Education Excellence Fund (EEF); business partnerships, donations, line item appropriations. In 2008-2009, participating districts will receive an allocation of state 8(g) money for TAP.

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	18,234
Applied to transfer	2,298
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,490

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	\$ 4,100,474

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	10

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	19,732
Applied for supplemental educational services	8,667
Received supplemental educational services	6,004
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	\$ 5,783,763
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	179,094	153,799	85.9	25,295	14.1
All elementary classes	83,549	76,763	91.9	6,786	8.1
All secondary classes	95,545	77,036	80.6	18,509	19.4

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.

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Louisiana uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject.

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	38.3
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	16.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	45.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	44.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	12.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	43.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

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	5,594	5,463	97.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	36,684	31,971	87.2
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	8,907	8,340	93.6
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	24,002	16,971	70.7

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	91.7	57.5
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch were used to measure poverty.	
Secondary schools	83.9	46.8
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch were used to measure poverty.	

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/French
No	Two-way immersion	
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	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.

Several LEAs use push-in where students are served in the mainstream classroom with ESL teacher or paraprofessional providing clarification and translation as needed. One LEA uses transitional bilingual in one school. In the program, students receive instruction in Spanish literacy until they reach the 3rd grade.

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	12,527
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.	11,715
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	8,483
Vietnamese	1,679
Arabic	657
Chinese	336
French	253

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	11,919
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	172
Total	12,091
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,713
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	14.2
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	11,142
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	161
Total	11,303
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	4,011

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	3,432	38.9	3,138	44.00
ELP attainment	1,550	17.6	891	8.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
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
3,990	565	4,555
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,527	1,324	86.7	203
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,527	1,339	87.7	188
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
1,501	1,246	83.0	255
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	30
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	15
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	19
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	26
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	29
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	5
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
Comments: Separate consortia members were counted in the total number of subgrantees and in AMAOs 1, 2, and 3, determinations.	

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
3,049		9

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	214
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	231

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total 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	23	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	24	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	21	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	13	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	15	
Other (Explain in comment box)	4	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	23	4,135
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	19	566
PD provided to principals	18	582
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	22	534
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	16	585
PD provided to community based organization personnel	9	382
Total	107	6,784

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" workshops included: quarterly meetings with ESL teachers and paraprofessionals to discuss various topics depending upon student needs; AHA! workshops regarding understanding students from poverty; and parental and community workshops on parental leadership, reading at home, and helping children succeed in school.

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
07/01/08	07/01/08	0
Comments: Funds are available to subgrantees upon submission of approved application.		

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.

In 2009-2010 funding cycle, the State implemented procedures to the Louisiana Department of Education Electronic Grants Management System (eGMS) to have all applications substantially approved by 8/31/09. All sub-grantees were required to submit budgets by 7/30/09 for each of the NCLB programs for which funding is received to obtain "substantial approval" status. Sub-grantees, through communications with program and finance staff, continued to work on budgets until such time that full approval of the budget application was obtained. All applications were approved in 10/2009.

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: There were no persistently dangerous schools in Louisiana in SY 2008-09.	

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	65.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	56.0
Hispanic	65.0
White, non-Hispanic	73.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35.0
Limited English proficient	57.0
Economically disadvantaged	58.0
Migratory students	47.0
Male	59.0
Female	72.0

Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate. Data were not submitted in the previous CSPR.

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	6.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.2
Black, non-Hispanic	9.9
Hispanic	6.9
White, non-Hispanic	4.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12.2
Limited English proficient	7.3
Economically disadvantaged	7.6
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
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	87	87
LEAs with subgrants	15	15
Total	102	102
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)	560	1,069
K	1,005	1,319
1	1,092	1,446
2	1,030	1,373
3	994	1,349
4	982	1,397
5	805	1,072
6	701	1,043
7	703	966
8	732	1,077
9	603	993
10	368	728
11	342	517
12	259	697
Ungraded	21	119
Total	10,197	15,165
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	964	1,494
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	7,627	11,470
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1,307	1,848
Hotels/Motels	299	353
Total	10,197	15,165
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,203
K	1,393
1	1,534
2	1,519
3	1,383
4	1,455
5	1,102
6	1,092
7	1,051
8	1,146
9	977
10	703
11	555
12	577
Ungraded	239
Total	15,929
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	539
Migratory children/youth	82
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,350
Limited English proficient students	443
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	14
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	14
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	13
Transportation	11
Early childhood programs	14
Assistance with participation in school programs	13
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	15
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	15
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	15
Coordination between schools and agencies	15
Counseling	14
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	10
Clothing to meet a school requirement	15
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	15
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
Other (optional – in comment box below)	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The other services reported by LEAs include bus tokens for alternative transportation for unaccompanied youth to remain in school of origin, referrals to local community social agencies, hygiene kits and other educational enrichment activities.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	2
Transportation	1
School records	2
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	925	465
4	958	574
5	778	366
6	657	342
7	670	278
8	737	313
High School	462	219
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	924	490
4	957	463
5	779	384
6	656	359
7	671	287
8	729	259
High School	457	251
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)	361
K	236
1	276
2	272
3	296
4	257
5	244
6	210
7	259
8	205
9	180
10	142
11	119
12	121
Ungraded	45
Out-of-school	159
Total	3,382
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The FFY 2007-2008 child count was 3249. The FFY 2008-2009 child count is 3378. The difference is 129 students, which is not greater 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)	10
K	13
1	19
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	36
5	N<10
6	10
7	10
8	14
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	143
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 FY 2007-2008 Category 2 Child Count was 576 compared to the 143 students in the FY08-09 Category 2 Child Count. Louisiana's migrant education programs historically have not offered programs during intercession periods, so the decrease in the Category 2 child count relates to changes in enrollment of migrant students in MEP-funded summer projects.

Fewer MEP-funded summer programs [that met the state education agency's minimum standard for number of hours/days/weeks of operation to qualify to be counted as such] were offered by Louisiana's eight LOAs in summer 2009 than in summer 2008. Fewer students participated in 2009 migrant education-funded summer school programs compared to summer 2008 primarily due to changing economic factors. The reduced price of gasoline in the summer of 2009 compared to 2008 allowed families more flexibility in traveling in the summer more frequently within the state and interstate leaving less time for children and youth to attend school-based migrant-funded summer programs. By contrast, the migrant education programs ensured that eligible migrant students enrolled in summer remediation programs funded by other sources such as local and state dollars.

As always, for the older migrant students, summer job opportunities competed with school-based educational opportunities even more so in the summer of 2009 due to the drastic change in the U.S. economy from summer 2008 to 2009. Federally-declared natural disasters (Hurricanes Gustav and Ike) also occurred in Louisiana in September 2008 that lengthened the school year for the most impacted districts by one or more weeks. During 2008-09 severe drought and torrential rain prior to and during planting and harvesting seasons were experienced throughout certain regions in Louisiana. Both natural disasters and the amount of precipitation had an effect on the number of migrant students in certain areas of Louisiana during summer 2009.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Migrant Education Records in Louisiana (MERIL2) or MIS 2000 was used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts. MERIL2 is the system used to calculate the 2007-2008 child count and 2008-2009 child count.

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.

In Louisiana when children are first recruited, data for each child's Certificate Of Eligibility (COE) is entered into the MERIL-2 system. This information includes not only parent/guardian information and qualifying work activities, but also key dates, such as each child's birth date, the qualifying arrival date (also known as the last qualifying move date) and the residency date. In addition, if the child is enrolled in school, the data specialist enters the actual school enrollment date. All of these dates are used in the calculation process. In addition to COE data, school histories are maintained on all migrant children entered. This is done continuously throughout the year.

School enrollments are entered in MERIL-2 after the advocates have verified each child's presence in school, his/her school enrollment date and his/her grade level. This is referred to as "mass enrollment" and is done on or after September 1 each year. A list of the children who were in each service area the previous year is provided to all advocates. The advocates check on each child on the list, either with school or home visits, to verify data. This list is used to record either the school enrollment (including grade level and any school changes), or to record that the children have moved or were unable to be located.

Louisiana uses this process instead of securing new COEs or updating COEs on each family because it accomplishes the requirement to verify and document the presence of each child with a minimized paperwork burden. In addition to the mass enrollment process at the beginning of the school year, a mass withdrawal process is done much the same way at the end of the school year. When the advocates have collected all the data, they sign, date and return the COEs to the data specialists, who enter and file the signed COEs for documentation of each student's residence.

The advocates also update school histories throughout the year by completing movement notification forms and submitting them to the data specialist. The data specialists enter the movement dates as the withdrawal date and termination date in MERIL-2. The movement notification forms are filed in the students' folders. Summer school enrollment is noted on the individual child's needs assessment form. These forms are submitted to the data specialists, who enter the summer school line and service provided and file the form in each student's folder.

Summer/inter-session project enrollment information is collected at the end of each project. Field personnel completed paper versions of COEs and data from COE was input into MERIL-2 system by the data specialist.

Update interviews are conducted at the beginning of each new school year during a child's eligibility period. Also, recruiters and advocates monitor school histories and enrollments throughout the year and update interviews are conducted as needed.

No. Field personnel completed paper versions of COEs and data was input into MERIL2 system by data specialist.

Update interviews are conducted at the beginning of each new school year during a child's eligibility period. Also, recruiters and advocates monitor school histories and enrollments throughout the year and update interviews are conducted as needed.

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.

All of the MEP student data are run entirely from the MERIL-2 data system. Data specialists from each of the eight regions (LOAs) enter all of the pertinent migrant data into the MERIL-2 system. The data are uploaded to the state server where the state staff reviews all COEs and other migrant data as appropriate. If corrections are to be made to any of the migrant student data, data specialists are notified by state staff, and corrections are duly made and uploaded on a weekly basis. At present, the MERIL-2 data system houses all the appropriate migrant data on migrant students in the state.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The first step in ensuring only eligible students are counted is our ongoing quality control check of COEs. A statewide network of recruiters is the cornerstone for the entire process. Working regionally to ensure that every geographic region of the state is canvassed, recruiters ascertain and document the eligibility of every child to be enrolled in the Migrant Education Program.

A Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for each qualifying family, recording the name, birth date, and other significant data for each child. The COE serves a double purpose; not only does it document the eligibility for each child determined to qualify for the MEP in Louisiana, but it also provides the source for relevant data to be entered into the MERIL-2 database system. The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the COES are verified through a quality control process that has been in place since 1989.

This process began with thorough training of recruiters, who are provided technical assistance and periodic updates on statutory or regulatory changes. Every COE is checked by state level staff, assuring that all required information has been provided. Any child determined to be ineligible for the Migrant Education Program is removed from the database.

In calculating the count of eligible students for the reporting period, only students who meet the program eligibility guidelines are counted, using several mathematical checks that are utilized to ensure that children are within the eligible age range and had a documented residency during the period. MERIL-2 calculates fields of LQM3 (last qualifying move date plus three years), twenty-second birth date (birth date plus twenty-two years), and third birth date (birth date plus three years).

The counting program selects only children who resided in the state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1/08-8/31/09), whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 9/1/08 whose third birth date is less than or equal to 8/31/09, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date. The residency determination is made by selecting only children whose funding date (school enrollment date or generated date of residency date for students not in school) is between 9/1/08 and 8/31/09, residency date is between 9/1/08 and 8/31/09, withdrawal date is between 9/1/08 and 8/31/09, or termination date is between 9/1/08 and 8/31/09.

The summer report selects children who received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term and whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 5/25/09, whose twenty-second birth date is greater than or equal to 5/26/09, whose third birth date is less than or equal to 8/13/09, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date or termination is null, whose third birth date is less than or equal to the withdrawal date or the withdrawal date is null, whose enrollment date was between 5/26/09 and 8/13/09, and whose enrollment type was S (summer). The earliest began on 5/26/09, and the latest ended 8/13/09. If the service was not entered, the data specialist enters it. If the enrollment was entered in error, it is removed.

MERIL-2 assures that students are counted only once per child count category by assigning each child a student sequence number. If a child has multiple school history lines that fit the funding criteria, MERIL-2 only counts the student sequence number once.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has a standard Certificate of Eligibility that is used statewide. Student eligibility is based on personal interviews with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult. Recruiter training is conducted at least annually by the SEA and/or regional LOAs, and training covers topics such as eligibility requirements, eligibility definition, principal means of livelihood, and temporary versus seasonal employment.

Louisiana ensures that students qualify before they are entered into the MERIL-2 system. The quality control process for checking Certificate Of Eligibility (COE) takes place within a period of 48 hours or as soon as possible thereafter. If a COE is determined ineligible, the child's preliminary records are deleted from the system.

Throughout the year, checks are taken by staff to ensure that no duplications exist with student records. On the LOA level, the data specialist begins the process of entering COEs by conducting a search of the state data base to determine whether the child is already in the system, thereby, avoiding duplicate entries. When similar names are encountered, the data specialist reviews birth dates, parent's names, other data to determine whether the name is new, or a duplicate. If the data specialist determines that the name matches an existing student, the record is downloaded into the regional database and updated with whatever information from the COE is new, such as a more recent qualifying move or a residency in a new school district. If there is no match for the name or names on the COE, the data specialist creates a new record. At the end of each working day, all information is uploaded to the state database so that it exists in both sites. There is a further check at the state level to ensure that duplicate entries are avoided.

When review of COEs for eligibility and accuracy is completed, state staff will again search the database for possible duplicates, double-checking the initial search at the regional level. If duplicates are identified, state staff will merge the two records into one and then contact the regional office to download the merged record.

Final steps that are taken by state staff to verify child counts before they are submitted, include identifying:

- 1) Students with matching social security numbers;
- 2) Students with matching date of birth, and last names (excluding students marked as multiple births);
- 3) Students with the same first name and date of birth -but totally different last names (possibly adopted or married);
- 4) Students with same last names, and similar date of birth.

All LOAs were instructed to verify that summer enrollments were based on programs and services provided during the actual period of summer vacation in the relevant school district. (School schedules vary from district to district.) The LOAs are also instructed to keep documentation of summer services.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The re-interview process is conducted throughout the year within the local operating agencies. The state is divided into eight MEP regions, and each region conducts its own re-interviews under the written guidance of the SEA. Each region generates a list of migrant families to be re-interviewed by using a MERIL2/2000 feature designed to produce a random sample for this purpose called a snap report. The snap reports are organized according to school district name in order to facilitate location of the families.

The LOA re-interviewer attempts to make a home visit or calls the family and uses the ConQir Consortium-developed re-interview questions. If the family cannot be located the first time, no more than two further attempts are made to re-interview the family.

During the re-interview, all data regarding eligibility and student information is verified. All discrepancies are noted for review and correction and a decision is made on the validity of the original eligibility determination by the re-interviewer. When the random list is completed or no more families can be located, the re-interviewer reports the results of the re-interviews to the regional director who reviews the report and determines, with assistance of the SEA, what actions need to be taken if errors or ineligible children are found.

Local re-interviewers are trained on eligibility documentation requirements and the re-interview process much the same as recruiters are trained. Results are recorded on these forms and kept for our records.

During the 2008-2009 fiscal year, the state hired an external contractor to do child eligibility re-interviewing. The contractor was asked to focus on two groups or target populations: children enrolled in the MEP during 2008-09, with priority given to families most recently having an initial interview (within six weeks of the initial interview) including families of children prior to their inclusion in the state child count. Priority was given to families newly identified whenever possible, with re-interview of families identified during the 2008-09 school year addressed after newly identified families were re-interviewed. Approximately 400 families were re-interviewed and very few discrepancies were found. After further investigation, all families were determined to be eligible for migrant services. As an additional quality control procedure, a separate contractor with expertise in migrant student identification reviewed the work of the independent re-interviewer.

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 accurate? Throughout the year, regional MEP staff meet for a minimum of one day each month to review all COEs for accuracy and to ensure the timely input of data into the MERIL-2 data system. Data specialists enter COE information into the data system on a daily basis after receiving the COE from the recruiters. The COEs are sent to the state office via fax, then reviewed and compared with the electronic version.

The state office is solely responsible for the merging of duplicate migrant student records. As duplicate records are discovered, data specialists provide the state with a list of migrant student records that should be merged. State staff performs the merge of records, then checks within the data system to ensure that records have been merged successfully. The regional data specialists are informed of the merge. Data specialists are diligent in their work to consistently review and perform the data check that is required for the continuous, correct, and timely input of COE information into the MERIL-2 system.

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.

Before the submission of the Category 1 and Category 2 child count data for federal reporting, state staff runs several reports of both of the child counts, as well as compares the reports to a list of the students for each child count. Staff reviews each report for accuracy to promote error-free reporting.

The Category 1 and Category 2 child counts are reviewed by the MEP State Director to further provide an additional review of the data that will be submitted.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2008-09 prospective re-interviewing results did not trigger any corrective actions or improvements. The state provides recruiter/advocate training with additional updates on the regulations in the area of the identification and recruitment of eligible migrant students. Ongoing quarterly meetings with the MEP recruiter's committee have been instrumental in improving and updating Louisiana's recruiters manual to reflect the new regulations and guidelines.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has no concerns at this time about the accuracy of the 2008-09 child counts or underlying eligibility determinations. All information has been validated by regional and state personnel using the MIS2000/MERIL2 database, COEs, parental/guardian interviews, school records, and other relative documentation.