

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

MASSACHUSETTS



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009

PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Massachusetts

Address:
75 Pleasant St.
Malden, MA 02148

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Robert Curtin

Telephone: 781-338-3582

Fax: 781-338-6850

e-mail: rcurtin@doe.mass.edu

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Mitchell D. Chester

Monday, December 21, 2009, 9:42:14 AM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MDESE) currently has academic content standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. These can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html>.

Massachusetts has signed onto the development of the Common Core standards initiative for English Language Arts and Mathematics led by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association. The Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education will review the revised drafts of the Common Core Standards shortly after the new year and will vote on whether to adopt these standards by August 2010.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	506,664		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,390		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,950		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	41,497		>97%
Hispanic	70,767		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	356,924		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	91,510		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27,942		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	162,511		>97%
Migratory students	27		>97%
Male	260,355		>97%
Female	246,052		>97%

Comments: First-year LEP students are assessed for diagnostic purposes and do not receive performance levels. Therefore, there will be differences in some of the categories between those assessed and the number receiving performance levels.

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	10,389	11.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	71,198	79.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	233	0.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,051	9.0
Total	89,871	
Comments: Eighty-three first-year LEP and SPED students are assessed for diagnostic purposes and do not receive performance levels. Therefore, there will be differences in some of the categories between those assessed and the number receiving performance levels.		

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	506,221		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,387		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,863		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	41,362		>97%
Hispanic	70,512		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	356,853		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	91,478		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27,534		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	162,174		>97%
Migratory students	26		>97%
Male	260,065		>97%
Female	245,788		>97%
Comments: First-year LEP students are assessed for diagnostic purposes and do not receive performance levels. Therefore, there will be differences in some of the categories between those assessed and the number receiving performance levels.			

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	9,342	10.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72,279	80.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	162	0.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,894	8.8
Total	89,677	
Comments: Seventy-eight first-year LEP and SPED students are assessed for diagnostic purposes and do not receive performance levels. Therefore, there will be differences in some of the categories between those assessed and the number receiving performance levels.		

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	264,888		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	733		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,249		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	22,724		>97%
Hispanic	36,577		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	186,850		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	46,676		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,781		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	82,192		>97%
Migratory students	12		>97%
Male	135,567		>97%
Female	129,206		>97%
Comments: First-year LEP students are assessed for diagnostic purposes and do not receive performance levels. Therefore, there will be differences in some of the categories between those assessed and the number receiving performance levels.			

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	5,970	14.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,458	77.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	76	0.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,971	7.3
Total	40,475	
Comments: First-year LEP students are assessed for diagnostic purposes and do not receive performance levels. Therefore, there will be differences in some of the categories between those assessed and the number receiving performance levels.		

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	70,791	42,320	59.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	76	49.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,909	2,814	72.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,362	1,789	33.4
Hispanic	10,703	3,743	35.0
White, non-Hispanic	48,910	32,853	67.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,177	3,362	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,750	1,721	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	23,769	9,023	38.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,416	21,559	59.2
Female	34,344	20,753	60.4
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

1.3.2.1 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	70,675	40,692	57.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	77	49.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,884	2,510	64.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,359	1,865	34.8
Hispanic	10,604	3,339	31.5
White, non-Hispanic	48,898	31,901	65.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,149	2,805	23.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,667	1,273	22.5
Economically disadvantaged students	23,669	8,232	34.8
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,338	19,740	54.3
Female	34,286	20,939	61.1
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The ESE does not assess grade 3 students in Science.			

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	70,709	33,881	47.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	72	36.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,568	2,281	63.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,599	1,366	24.4
Hispanic	10,188	2,611	25.6
White, non-Hispanic	49,610	26,843	54.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,743	2,075	16.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,560	856	18.8
Economically disadvantaged students	23,310	6,367	27.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,216	17,226	47.6
Female	34,468	16,649	48.3
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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	70,471	37,748	53.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	85	42.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,550	2,191	61.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,567	1,620	29.1
Hispanic	10,138	2,810	27.7
White, non-Hispanic	49,461	30,277	61.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,681	2,114	16.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,524	779	17.2
Economically disadvantaged students	23,198	6,862	29.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,062	17,099	47.4
Female	34,365	20,643	60.1
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The ESE does not assess grade four students in science.			

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	71,793	38,653	53.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	76	42.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,634	2,611	71.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,690	1,733	30.5
Hispanic	9,944	2,868	28.8
White, non-Hispanic	50,883	30,627	60.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,600	2,488	18.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,649	753	20.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,378	7,470	32.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,938	19,780	53.6
Female	34,833	18,867	54.2
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,661	45,072	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	90	49.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,622	2,555	70.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,672	2,208	38.9
Hispanic	9,853	3,446	35.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,850	35,855	70.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,587	3,203	23.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,593	612	17.0
Economically disadvantaged students	23,273	9,218	39.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,838	21,363	58.0
Female	34,779	23,696	68.1
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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.

1.3.3.3 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	71,686	34,788	48.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	64	35.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,631	2,157	59.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,680	1,024	18.0
Hispanic	9,914	2,059	20.8
White, non-Hispanic	50,822	28,792	56.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,563	2,817	20.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,640	408	11.2
Economically disadvantaged students	23,324	5,582	23.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,875	18,908	51.3
Female	34,789	15,875	45.6
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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	71,085	40,301	56.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	220	92	41.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,516	2,674	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,646	1,791	31.7
Hispanic	9,630	2,864	29.7
White, non-Hispanic	50,656	32,104	63.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,384	2,533	18.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,999	580	19.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,870	7,747	33.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,584	20,531	56.1
Female	34,478	19,766	57.3
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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	70,999	47,283	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	127	58.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,503	2,655	75.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,642	2,581	45.8
Hispanic	9,582	3,869	40.4
White, non-Hispanic	50,627	37,116	73.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,383	3,452	25.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,943	530	18.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,818	10,043	44.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,531	22,142	60.6
Female	34,432	25,127	73.0
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The ESE does not assess grade six students in Science.			

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	71,975	35,410	49.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	67	34.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,635	2,527	69.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,831	1,374	23.6
Hispanic	9,693	2,202	22.7
White, non-Hispanic	51,300	28,623	55.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,264	1,680	12.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,725	309	11.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,747	5,910	26.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,128	18,094	48.7
Female	34,809	17,309	49.7
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

1.3.2.5 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	71,696	50,141	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	118	60.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,625	2,849	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,792	2,881	49.7
Hispanic	9,609	4,115	42.8
White, non-Hispanic	51,146	39,253	76.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,193	3,704	28.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,642	395	15.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,585	10,755	47.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,967	23,631	63.9
Female	34,679	26,490	76.4
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The ESE does not assess grade seven students in Science.			

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	73,170	35,822	49.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	64	29.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,568	2,419	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	6,157	1,441	23.4
Hispanic	9,686	2,119	21.9
White, non-Hispanic	52,203	29,162	55.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,314	1,591	12.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,485	296	11.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,948	5,797	25.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,564	18,098	48.2
Female	35,567	17,720	49.8
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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	73,140	57,543	78.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	215	137	63.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,575	3,027	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,119	3,871	63.3
Hispanic	9,692	5,422	55.9
White, non-Hispanic	52,186	44,037	84.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,315	5,291	39.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,461	573	23.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,934	13,958	60.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,539	27,983	74.5
Female	35,548	29,536	83.1
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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.

1.3.3.6 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	72,982	28,595	39.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	46	21.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,566	1,765	49.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,135	821	13.4
Hispanic	9,611	1,197	12.4
White, non-Hispanic	52,117	24,253	46.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,243	1,407	10.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,478	92	3.7
Economically disadvantaged students	22,825	3,673	16.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,461	15,263	40.7
Female	35,482	13,329	37.6
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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.

1.3.1.7 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	70,194	52,094	74.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	122	67.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,364	2,873	85.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,950	3,074	51.7
Hispanic	8,519	4,117	48.3
White, non-Hispanic	50,995	41,080	80.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,389	4,225	37.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,210	699	31.6
Economically disadvantaged students	19,267	10,485	54.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	35,651	26,290	73.7
Female	34,478	25,780	74.8
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

1.3.2.7 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	70,383	56,606	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	137	75.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,360	2,759	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,947	3,785	63.6
Hispanic	8,564	4,942	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	51,126	44,054	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,369	4,837	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,178	433	19.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19,316	12,144	62.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	35,727	27,330	76.5
Female	34,574	29,236	84.6
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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

1.3.3.7 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	115,288	70,134	60.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	307	159	51.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,658	4,032	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	10,048	3,161	31.5
Hispanic	15,382	4,143	26.9
White, non-Hispanic	82,014	57,548	70.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,494	4,399	23.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,803	485	12.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,058	11,252	34.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	58,452	35,842	61.3
Female	56,787	34,284	60.4
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.			

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	1,732	654	37.8
Districts	385	81	21.0
Comments: A total of 1,722 schools received AYP determinations. Ten schools were too small or closed and did not receive a determination.			

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	985	305	31.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	463	68	14.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	522	237	45.4
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
371	76	20.5
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement ¹ Year 1, School Improvement ¹ Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	52
Extension of the school year or school day	49
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	17
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	22
Replacement of the principal	9
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	37
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	67
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)	27
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	2
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	193
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.

The 10 largest urban districts are identified as the "Commissioner's Districts and receive Title I funds to support agreed upon improvement strategies. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is developed to guide each district's work, and the state assigns a liaison to oversee district progress. The remaining districts with NCLB status received support through a regional state system of support model that was implemented in 2007-08 and 2008-09. The state is providing a menu of professional development opportunities and other targeted assistance work to help districts improve teaching and learning in their schools, collect / use data to make decisions to understand the effectiveness of these efforts and to create opportunities for groups of educators across many districts to come together to share effective practices.

1. Commissioner's Districts -In 2007-2008, the ESE reorganized the structure of its assistance delivery system using a cohort approach determined by the size and accountability status of its districts. Ten of the largest urban districts, in which over 80% of the state's schools in Corrective Action and Restructuring in the aggregate were located, became known as the Commissioner's Districts. All of these districts were in Corrective Action under NCLB as well. Department staff and resources were prioritized to support these districts.

Memoranda of Understanding were negotiated with each of the Commissioner's Districts to identify district needs and to document district and ESE staffing and financial resources that would be deployed to address the needs. Periodic discussions were framed to review district and school data, as well as to reflect on the progress of district improvement initiatives and oversight in the schools with NCLB status.

2 Urban Superintendents Network -Twenty-four of the state's districts in Corrective Action or Improvement meet monthly in a leadership network. The Urban Superintendents Network provides monthly networking opportunity for districts with common challenges to meet together and with ESE. Monthly meetings, planned collaboratively by a Department of Education and Superintendent team, provide opportunities for information sharing and policy input, as well as focused problem solving and collaboration among the districts and with the Department of Education. In 2008-2009, the Network held multi-meeting focused discussions with the Superintendents and other members of their leadership teams to analyze needs and share effective strategies on pressing topics to provide a springboard for additional collaboration among the districts and department. These topical discussions included: mathematics achievement, educational programming and performance for English language learners, and the persistent graduation and drop out challenges. These focused discussions have resulted in additional collaboration with dedicated district and Department staff through networking and work groups to work together to improve school and district practices and develop new solutions to persistent, common challenges.

3 Mathematics Liaisons -Each of the 24 urban districts in the Commonwealth has appointed a liaison to this statewide network. The director of mathematics in the district typically serves in this role and often brings other members of the math leadership team to the monthly meeting. Liaisons act as the bridge between statewide programs and local math initiatives and are responsible for both integrating statewide opportunities into district activities as well as scaling up local efforts to improve student achievement in mathematics. The network collaborates around shared issues to problem-solve, build capacity, and provide feedback on mathematics initiatives and ESE policy. The Mathematics Liaisons typically meet monthly during the school year. Last year, the network reviewed trends in AYP data, shared on systemic improvements related to CSR that contributed to improvement in their districts, and collaboratively selected and examined twelve mathematics intervention programs to inform purchasing decisions.

4 Of the remaining 350+ districts across the state, there is a wide range of size, demographics, communities, and level of infrastructure. Four districts are designated as Underperforming under the MA School and District Accountability System, 108 are in Corrective Action or Improvement status; and a total of 957 schools are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. We recognize the need to provide all districts with support, and are developing a system that will initially address the schools and districts most in need of support, but ultimately provide tiered support to all districts in the Commonwealth.

In an effort to leverage resources and maximize the impact of federal funds, we directed a percentage of the FY08 and FY09 Title I School Improvement Grant regionally to Title I districts that had an accountability status of Corrective Action and/or had Title I schools in corrective action or restructuring for the aggregate. In groups of at least three, districts operated federally supported summer academies for teachers and in some cases, students, to improve teacher instructional practice and student achievement in ELA and mathematics. This regional distribution of funding enabled us to pilot a more collaborative regional approach to supporting small and medium sized districts in need of intervention that alone lack the infrastructure and capacity to address causes of low performance. From the 2008 data, we have learned that districts have greater capacity working together regionally towards school improvement efforts than they do working alone. In many cases, cross-district networks were formed that have continued to collaborate beyond the grant period.

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:	

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	9	9
Schools	33	30
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	11/10/09
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	110,750	109,112
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	39,594	37,844
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	35.8	34.7
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	110,419	109,002
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	51,515	50,945
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	46.6	46.7
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	43
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	7
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	333
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		95	1	3	A	

Comments: The schools participating in row number one are those identified as "Commonwealth Priority Schools" and are located in the ten "Commissioner's Districts." The ESE continues to develop plans to expand effective school improvement strategies to districts and schools across the state. Options 1, 2, 3, and four are to be offered through the State System of Support during the 2009-10 school year to an expanded number of districts and schools.

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

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.

1. Tools -The ESE has developed tools and protocols to support district leadership to monitor and collect data on teaching and learning practices. An example is a set of tools to support collecting data on classroom practices through a 'learning walk'. The Department trained school and district leaders in the Commissioner's Districts to use the tools and has modeled the effective use of the tools in districts' classrooms. The Learning Walk Continuum, along with the associated protocols and templates, is intended to provide a framework for conducting evidence based observations in classrooms to gather and report on information about teaching and learning practices in schools. The Learning Walk Continuum has been used by teams of state, school and district leaders to conduct periodic 20-30 minute classroom observations in a school. New tools have been developed and used to support effective use of common planning time and professional learning. They include:

District Data Team Tool Kit

A. A systematic approach to helping a district build the capacity to use multiple data sources to continuously improve teaching and learning in all schools

B. A collection of resources based on the Data-Driven Inquiry and Action Cycle that guides data use from asking the right questions to getting results

Why use the District Data Team Tool Kit?

A. To improve the systematic use of data to inform decisions about curriculum, instruction, resource allocation, and other vital district functions

B. The Toolkit can help a district:

C. Organize a District Data Team to facilitate productive use of data district-wide

D. Learn and practice the steps of an effective data use model

E. Access tools and resources to support data use throughout the district

District Data Team Tool Kit Components:

A. Introduction and overview of the tool kit

B. District self-assessment

C. Six modules with background information, protocols, templates, and examples, aligned to the Data-Driven Inquiry and Action Cycle

PLC Guidance Document: Establishing and Maintaining Professional Learning Communities

A. Articulates six stages of development of a district-wide culture of collaborative learning and planning.

B. For each stage, actions are identified that would take place at the level of teacher, principal, and district leadership.

Why use the PLC Guidance Document?

A. Guide the reflection and action of teams at all levels within the district

B. Promote common understanding and language related to PLCs

C. Lay the groundwork for engagement with other ESE resources and tool kits

PLC Guidance Document Components

A. "At-a-Glance" summary document

B. Detailed guidance document

1 Networking -As stated above, the Department has promoted networking and has used these networks to focus on particular issues of practices. From the Urban Superintendents Network, a Working Group was formed to support collaborative learning among district teams to foster effective drop out prevention strategies and to improve graduation rates. The Mathematics Liaison network collaboratively developed a document to share effective strategies for mathematics coaching. Similarly, the Science Liaison Network supported the development of a document on the Characteristics of An Effective Standards Based Mathematics Classroom that promoted a common vision among science educators and science departments in the urban districts.

2 Training -The Department supports quality 'Train the Trainer' programs for teachers of English Language Learners including sheltering content and English and a Second Language. In addition, schools and districts receiving Reading First or the state-funded John Silber Early Reading Initiative funding for K-3 reading instruction participated in comprehensive ongoing professional development. This included: 1) participation in statewide professional development delivered by nationally recognized experts on topics identified by ESE as critical to improvement efforts. In 2007-2008, topics included writing to inform reading comprehension and literacy skills and content area knowledge; 2) participation in ongoing professional development to link research to practice; and 3) school and district support for the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices including support of school-based literacy coaches.

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Technical Assistance -contracted with the Center for Collaborative Education.

The Center for Collaborative Education (CCE) served as a critical resource to the state's Commonwealth Pilot School Initiative and four Commonwealth Pilot Schools. CCE provide technical assistance, coaching and support to district and school leaders of 4 Commonwealth Pilot Schools. CCE's technical assistance services include the following: support for the full implementation of the Commonwealth Pilot School model; support for teachers to implement high standards in teaching and learning; continued training and support for the school governing board and training for staff on selected professional development topics.

Evaluation Assistance -contracted with the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute

The University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute (the Institute) served as the statewide evaluator for the Commonwealth Pilot Schools Initiative. Their reports offered detailed analysis of the change process and initial results at each of the participating schools. In addition to serving as a resource to ESE program managers, CCE coaches, and district and school leaders, its findings will inform the development of a policy brief regarding turnaround efforts. The report is intended to describe and summarize key school-level changes for Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) research managers and for managers of the Commonwealth Pilot Schools Initiative and similar school-based reform initiatives. This report will synthesize a wealth of data collected over the first and second years of the initiative. Data were obtained from a variety of sources, including ESE, school-and district-level interviews, school and district documentation, the annual Commonwealth Pilot Schools Staff Survey, and interviews and documentation provided by CCE leaders and coaches.

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.

The ESE has undertaken several initiatives to support school improvement for schools with NCLB status using state or other fund resources. These include:

- 1 School and District Leadership Training: Nearly 500 current and aspiring leaders have participated in the thirty-three day training conducted through the National Institute for School Leadership over the past few years.
- 2 Early Reading programs have been supported by state funds aligned with Reading First, John Silber grants and the Bay State Readers Program.
- 3 Training for Sheltered English Immersion teachers have been funded by state professional development funds for English language learners.
- 4 Expanded Learning Time programs have been funded in schools adding 25% more time to regular school days using state funding.
- 5 Support for redesigning or providing targeted assistance to chronically low performing schools has been provided using state resources.
- 6 Mathematics content training has been provided using both Title IIB and state funds.

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	302,826
Applied to transfer	753
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	753

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	\$ 1,518,013

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	142

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	21,701
Applied for supplemental educational services	8,946
Received supplemental educational services	8,066
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	\$ 11,085,529
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	279,737	269,989	96.5	9,748	3.5
All elementary classes	195,296	189,737	97.2	5,559	2.8
All secondary classes	84,441	80,252	95.0	4,189	5.0

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.

The ESE uses a departmentalized approach where self-contained elementary classrooms are weighted by a factor of five.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	36.7
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	7.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	55.7
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "Other" option was used because the ESE does not collect alternative route program information through our Education Personnel Information Management System, which is the source of the data above. Therefore, the data represented in "Other" are those teachers who are not fully certified, but their alternative program status is unknown.

	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)	30.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	8.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	60.9
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "Other" option was used because the ESE does not collect alternative route program information through our Education Personnel Information Management System, which is the source of the data above. Therefore, the data represented in "Other" are those teachers who are not fully certified, but their alternative program status is unknown.

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	50,204	47,959	95.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	49,275	48,175	97.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	17,303	15,971	92.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	25,355	24,533	96.8

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	54.2	8.1
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price Lunch percentage.	
Secondary schools	54.1	10.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price Lunch percentage.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	58,266
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.	44,578
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	30,718
Portuguese	4,384
Chinese	3,077
Haitian; Haitian Creole	2,493
Creoles and pidgins, Portuguese-based (Other)	2,456

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	54,862
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,404
Total	58,266
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	18,508
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	33.7
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	42,405
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,173
Total	44,578
Comments: fix.	
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.	9,704

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	17,823	40.9	26,146	60.00
ELP attainment	16,124	37.0	12,637	29.00
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).	Yes
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)
Spanish
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)
None
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)
None
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,001	4,856	9,857
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
9,275	3,946	42.5	5,329
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
9,263	4,676	50.5	4,587

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
3,839	989	25.8	2,850
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	56
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	9
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	49
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	48
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	9
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	4
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	37
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	34
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	30
Comments: There were a total of 56 subgrantees for the 2008-09 school year. Only 55 subgrantees are included in this AMAO table because two years of performance data are needed to make a determination.	

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
20,698		3

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,187
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	515

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

The estimated number of teachers is based upon an assumption that the number of LEP students will continue to increase at a rate consistent with the past three years.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **#Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	36	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	51	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	39	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	17	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	20	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	41	10,696
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	41	10,732
PD provided to principals	4	39
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	20	33
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	1	5
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	56	21,505

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Fifty-six subgrantees participated in professional development focused on four areas (SEI PD Categories) of skills and knowledge related to the education of English language learners: Category One/Second Language Learning and Teaching, Category Two/Sheltering Content Instruction, Category Three/Assessment of Speaking and Listening, and Category Four/Reading and Writing in Sheltered Content Classrooms. Teachers and administrators participated in category training; in one district, aides participated in one category training (Category 3). Some of these Title III districts also participated in the Massachusetts English Language Teacher (MELT) initiative. This program has completed two cohorts of classroom teachers seeking ESL licensure. In addition, ESE led a curriculum writing initiative and piloted a professional development training for principals and administrators.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/7/08	8/8/08	31
Comments:		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Massachusetts received its allocation letter from ED on July 7, 2008. Allocations to subgrantees were posted on August 8, 2008. Funds are not (cannot be) "distributed" to a district until their grant application has been approved. A majority (all but three) of the Title III grants were disbursed to subgrantees with a September 1, 2008 start date.

Personal contact and consultation were provided to each individual grantee as needed.

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: The ESE has not labeled any Massachusetts public school as "persistently dangerous."	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.7
Black, non-Hispanic	68.4
Hispanic	58.3
White, non-Hispanic	86.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	64.1
Limited English proficient	55.8
Economically disadvantaged	64.8
Migratory students	
Male	78.0
Female	84.7
Comments: Massachusetts did not calculate a graduation rate for migrant students due to the small number of students in the 2008 cohort.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	8.3
White, non-Hispanic	2.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.5
Limited English proficient	8.8
Economically disadvantaged	5.5
Migratory students	11.0
Male	3.8
Female	2.9
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	377	278
LEAs with subgrants	16	16
Total	393	294
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)	91	495
K	318	668
1	349	581
2	369	566
3	384	569
4	350	468
5	322	492
6	356	453
7	343	479
8	401	495
9	618	629
10	414	490
11	376	402
12	373	397
Ungraded	10	11
Total	5,074	7,195
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	2,817	3,222
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,673	3,252
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	19	97
Hotels/Motels	565	624
Total	5,074	7,195
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)	495
K	668
1	581
2	566
3	569
4	468
5	492
6	453
7	479
8	495
9	629
10	490
11	402
12	408
Ungraded	
Total	7,195
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	504
Migratory children/youth	99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,574
Limited English proficient students	1,621
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	15
Expedited evaluations	12
Staff professional development and awareness	15
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	14
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	14
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	13
Coordination between schools and agencies	16
Counseling	14
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	12
Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	14
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	14
Other (optional – in comment box below)	4
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Assistance provided with college applications and FAFSA. Also, districts provided immunizations.

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	2
School Selection	1
Transportation	3
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	5

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Mobility of families, identification (especially unaccompanied youth) and distance of transportation requests.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		
<p>Comments: The ESE did not have individual homeless student assessment information which made it difficult to meet the file specifications for this question. The ESE does have this information in the aggregate and these data can be obtained from the Department.</p>		

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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		
<p>Comments: The ESE did not have individual homeless student assessment information which made it difficult to meet the file specifications for this question. The ESE does have this information in the aggregate and these data can be obtained from the Department.</p>		

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)	78
K	22
1	23
2	10
3	10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	235
Total	407
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of Category 1 children reported for program year 2007 -2008 was 510 and the number of Category 1 children being reported for 2008 -2009 is 407, a reduction of 103 children or 20%.

The reduction in the number of children identified for the program year 2008 -2009 is attributed to several factors. First, the United State's enforcement of illegal immigration has had a significant effect on the number of migrant families willing to come forward to be interviewed for eligibility. In Massachusetts, there have been widely publicized crackdowns in which immigrant families have been broken apart and members detained and deported, which has resulted in migrant families being reluctant to provide the extensive identification information required to for eligibility determination.

Second, families that traditionally travel to the Western Region (Springfield, Holyoke, Northampton, Massachusetts) to work in agriculture did not arrive as they normally do between April and August. The summer in Massachusetts was unusually rainy and this had a negative affect on crop growth. The tobacco growers in western Massachusetts and in Connecticut either reduced or stopped production.

Third, in the Southeast Region, cranberry growers stopped production because too many cranberries were already in storage. The fishing industry, the other major employer of migrant workers in the Southeast Region, has been hurt by the restrictions placed on fishing.

Fourth, the North-central Region has been impacted by the restrictions in the fishing industry and by the downsizing of employees in food and fish processing plants.

In addition, a growing number of employers have determined that securing contracted workers is a more cost-efficient and a more manageable way for them to accomplish the necessary work. Massachusetts continued to see an increase in the percentage of emancipated youth/out-of-school youth, who have come to the Commonwealth as individual migrant workers, rather than families with children.

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)	53
K	9
1	14
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	
8	N<10
9	
10	N<10
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	50
Total	149
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of Category 2 children reported for program year 2007 -2008 was 173 and the number of Category 2 children reported for program year 2008 -2009 is 149, a decrease of 24 children served in the State's MMEP summer projects.

The number of children served in the MMEP summer projects has decreased by 14% and can be explained by a corresponding reduction (20%) in the number of eligible migrant children who could be served. The rate for migrant children participating in MMEP programs increased over this period from 34% to 37%.

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.

Massachusetts used a proprietary student information system to compile the Category 1 and Category 2 Counts. This system was developed exclusively for the Massachusetts Migrant Education Program using FileMaker Pro software. Last year's child counts were generated using the same system.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The identification and recruitment of migrant children is the primary role of Community Liaisons and is conducted twelve months a year. The Community Liaisons make the initial direct contact with the potentially eligible migrant family, obtain eligibility information, and have the primary responsibility for the determination and documentation of student eligibility. Day-to-day supervision of the Community Liaisons and implementation of identification and recruitment efforts are the responsibility of the MMEP's three Regional Directors, who are, in turn assisted by a team leader, or "verifier" who helps with the verification of all paperwork submitted.

Primary responsibility for system planning, policy, and interstate/intrastate coordination is assigned to the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator who is directly supervised by the State Director. Through this structure, the identification and recruitment component provides for regional supervision and coordination of identification and recruitment (Community Liaisons) while maintaining a centralized planning and monitoring system designed to ensure strict compliance with federal student eligibility requirements.

When potentially eligible migrant families have been located, the Community Liaisons ascertain eligibility through structured face-to-face interviews with the parents or guardians or with the emancipated youth. When recruiting in urban centers for families who have ceased to migrate but remain eligible for program services, Community Liaisons must assess the validity of the information gathered. This assessment may include contacting employers, reviewing industry surveys, and contacting community-based social service agencies. Once eligibility is determined, Community Liaisons complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and submit it for review and verification by the Regional Director and his/her "verifier." This documentation is reviewed once again by the ID and Recruitment Coordinator who both validates the paperwork with desk audits and face-to face interviews of families and/or emancipated youth who have been declared eligible.

At the point of identification, the Community Liaisons are required to recognize the family as being "new", "adding additional children" who joined the family after the LQM, or "enrolled previously". Between September and February each year, Community Liaisons interview every active eligible family during a face-to-face meeting to recheck and update the information on the COE.

The Community Liaisons are required to complete paper COE data sections on family (ethnicity, home language, father's last name, mother's last name, current address, current telephone number, school district), child[ren] (name, sex, birth date, school, grade, special services) and qualifying eligibility (date children moved from last city and date they arrived in current city, who they moved with or joined), in the case of an emancipated youth, (all information mentioned above and the date they moved and arrived is noted) who is doing temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing activity, date employment was sought or obtained, name of employer), and other clarifying information.

Community Liaisons are required to complete a data section on the standard COE on "Previous Qualifying Move(s), Activities, Address (es)". This provides information in addition to the LQM ---not only to substantiate the eligibility and to document residency, but also to identify families who may have made a migrant move within the Commonwealth and across programmatic Regions. This measure and other verification and validation measures are implemented to preclude the duplication of a family in the program's database.

The Pupil Records Coordinator searches "family last name and first"; "similar name"; "English cognates"; "addresses and telephone numbers". Then the Pupil Records Coordinator searches "student names"; "birth dates"; and "parents names". If the Pupil Records Coordinator finds a single match, she then "pulls" the COE from the file drawer, reviews it, and checks the signatures.

After determining the Category 1 child count, the data for the Category 2 child count is collected by looking at all students who received services after the last day of the regular school year and before the first day of the new school year. The data contained in this Report refers to activities documented between September 1, 2008 and August 31, 2009.

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 eligible families/students/youth are enrolled in the migrant program's principal state database at one centralized location by the MMEP Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the data directly from validated COEs. Before the Pupil Records Coordinator assigns the unique family and unique child numbers, a search is conducted utilizing the mother's name, the names and dates of birth of the children, and a review of all records under the same last name. No new family can be enrolled into the database without this screen for duplicates. The data system that we use has a built-in capacity to use "wildcards" for single pieces of data: The discovery of a single variable, which matches a child or family, signals to the Pupil Records Coordinator that she must pull the COE and examine the information contained in it and all of the signatures. In this way, duplication of a family/child is prevented.

If the search is negative, the new family is enrolled and a unique family number and a unique student number are assigned by the Pupil Records Coordinator. Although the program's database can be accessed by regional staff for generating reports, the system restricts the regional staff from having the ability to enroll families/students or update eligibility information. The Student Database consists of a collection of discrete records. Using the relational capacity of the system, it is able to track an infinite number of educational service experiences while maintaining a single unique record for each student. Student service data is collected and entered into the student enrollment record by regional staff. During the school year, Records Clerks gather the service data and enter it into an Enrollment Database, which is related to the Student Database. Record Aides are assigned to each summer project site and are responsible for the collection of daily attendance, service component information, and health-related information. The MMEP administrative staff and records staff have worked with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE -formerly Department of Education) to develop a memorandum of understanding to allow MMEP access to education data collected by ESE. This data, including SIMS (Student Information Management System data), MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System data) and MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment), is integrated into the MMEP student data system for purpose of informing operational decision making, completing and confirming demographic data and to contribute to the pool of data for MSIX (Migrant Student Records Exchange Initiative).

The health-related information that is collected and entered into the database consists of information on: A student's allergies; medications; screenings for dental, hearing, vision, podiatric, and skin/scalp; first aid that was administered at the summer site; health exam and dental exam information; and information about health problems, names of doctors, hospitals, and clinics. In addition, information is collected and entered into the database on all academic services that a student receives at the summer project site or through home-based services.

The student information is forwarded from the Support Center to the Record Clerks located in each Regional Office. The Record Clerks enter enrollment and attendance information into the enrollment database, a separate and distinct relational database. The Records Clerks are required to train the Records Aides and to visit summer sites to review and monitor the work of the Records Aides.

Two distinct databases -a "student database" and an "enrollment database"-are included in the Support Center's data warehouse. The student database has been organized to ensure that there is only one record per student. The enrollment database, a related database, is used to characterize each incidence of education service. We use the records in the enrollment database to "flag" the student records for inclusion in the Category 2 child count. The student database is searched for records that meet eligibility criteria, including eligibility for service for at least one day during summer of the report year by LQM; age-eligible; a check that the student has not been terminated before the beginning of that summer; and that the student has not turned three or has confirmation of residency after turning three during the report year. The student database is the primary generator of student counts because we can assure the "uniqueness" of each record, thereby avoiding duplication of student records in the counts.

The student database is the source for all student service data presented in reports such as OME's Category 1 and Category 2 Report. Within the student database only a single record exists for each student regardless of the number of services a student receives and despite the possibility of a student being served by more than one Massachusetts Migrant Education Program Region. In this database, an individual student cannot be counted more than once.

When migrant child counts are requested by local, state or federal sources, the Pupil Records Coordinator conditions the query to the student database to access the information needed. As an example, when Massachusetts needed to generate information for this Migrant Child Count Report (School Year 2008 -2009), the Pupil Records Coordinator first queried the system for all eligible children between the ages of 3 and 21 who had not graduated from high school, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who resided in Massachusetts between September 1, 2008 and August 31, 2009. An unduplicated count of 408 Category 1 migrant children was generated from that query. The Pupil Records Coordinator then queried the system for the count of all eligible children between the ages of 3 -21, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who received MEP-funded services between the last day of the 2008 -2009 school year and before the first day of the 2009 -2010 school year and who had not graduated from high school. An unduplicated count of 149 Category 2 migrant children was generated from that query.

When an eligible migrant student graduates from high school, the Community Liaison completes a "Change of Status Form" which is then forwarded to the Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the student as now being "inactive" and who enters the student's graduation date as the "termination date". Queries on the student database for Category 1 and 2 counts include an elaborate screening process. This process prevents the inclusion of three-year-olds whose residency has not been documented (after they turn three) prior to the end of the report year or their termination date from the program. Additional screening prevents children at any age from being included in the count if their residency status has not been documented. If a student's eligibility expires before the summer projects begin, the student is excluded from the services that are provided in the summer projects. Community Liaisons are alerted by the Records Clerks in advance of the date that potential Category 1 migrant children will turn three. Community Liaisons are asked to visit the family and to update the COE as soon as possible to document residency of all eligible children.

The MMEP Regional Offices, on an on-going basis, provide migrant student lists to all LEAs who are serving migrant students. These lists "flag" the eligible migrant students to assist the LEAs to plan appropriate support for those students and to facilitate the sharing of education information by the school and MMEP region.

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.

Category 1 Count: The Massachusetts Migrant Education Program's student database has a built-in calculation for the expiration of eligibility. To verify the accuracy of the database, on a daily basis the Pupil Records Coordinator does a "find" of active students between the ages of three through twenty-one who had not graduated from high school. If discrepancies are discovered, the Pupil Records Coordinator reviews the COEs and consults the Community Liaisons, the Records Clerks, and/or the Regional Director for a determination of eligibility on those students. All children turning three during the report period are tested for confirmation of residency after their third birthday---a face-to-face or telephone confirmation must be documented before the child's information is entered into a relational database. The same system is used for all other migrant students. For a student to be included in the twelve-month count, each one of the conditions mentioned above must be satisfied.

Category 2 Count: For a student to be included in the Category 2 count, the conditions mentioned above must be met along with one additional criterion ---that service has been provided through MEP funds (and documented in a related database) after the last day of the 2008 -2009 school year ended and before the 2009 -2010 school year began.

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 quality control system in place during the 2007 -2008 program year consisted of four phases and involved at least two individuals who shared responsibility for the review and monitoring of eligibility determinations. That system is described below:

Phase One: Quality control began with quality training. Each year Community Liaisons are required to attend (a) training sessions which review technical guides/reports, federal guidelines (eligibility, principal means of livelihood, etc.), the state Identification and Recruitment Manual and (b) additional training in interviewing techniques, information on welfare reform, education reform, access to social and human services, CHIPs information, and other information that impacts migrant families. On May 7 and May 21, 2008 the MMEP program sponsored workshops on recruitment strategies and practices which were presented by Merced Flores and David Gutierrez of the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) to all MMEP staff. (c) Each year Community Liaisons and Recruiters are required to pass a competency test in order to demonstrate requisite knowledge of all ID & R procedures and eligibility guidelines.

Phase Two: Community Liaisons submit the completed COEs to their Regional Director. All COEs are reviewed by the Regional Directors to determine if the eligibility determination was correct and creditable and that the COE was accurate and complete. To facilitate the verification process, the Regional Directors updated information on the major agricultural and fishing activities within their Region on a routine basis. If there are questions about information on COEs, the COEs are returned to the Community Liaisons for correction or further explanation.

Phase Three: Regional Directors submit their COEs to the Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator. All COEs are validated by the ID&R Coordinator to authorize student enrollment into the migrant program's student database. The review at this stage ensures that the eligibility of children considered to be migratory was properly documented and verified and that the eligibility data was creditable. If there were questions about information on the COEs, the COEs were returned to the Regional Directors for correction or further explanation.

Phase Four: The final quality control process--auditing--is done by the ID&R Coordinator on a "pre-enrollment" basis. During this phase, on a random sample basis, COEs of each Community Liaison are "field audited" (by telephone, letter, a home visit, a public school visit, and/or an employer visit) to ensure that both the identification and recruitment and information management systems are functioning properly. The ID&R Coordinator reviewed all "problematic" COEs with the MMEP State Director. It was the State Director who, in these rare cases, is the final arbitrator and determines whether the family/children are migratory and should be enrolled in the MMEP's student database.

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.

As stated elsewhere in this report, every COE is reviewed at the regional office and verified by the regional director. Within 5-10 days of receipt of a regionally verified COE at the Migrant Support Center, the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator would visit the residence or place of employment of a prospective migrant person in order to conduct a re-interview.

For the report period of September 1, 2008 to August 31, 2009, 35% of statewide verified Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) were subject to a re-interview procedure to ensure a high level of quality control

All re-interview sessions are attended by the Community Liaison/Recruiter, ID&R Coordinator, as well as the prospective migrant person. In the course of a re-interview session every item recorded on the eligibility section of the COE and the Emancipated Youth's age is reviewed for consistency and accuracy.

If the information on the COE is found to be consistent and accurate by the re-interviewing authority, the positive result of the re-interview session is noted on an independent form (Basic Interviewing Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form). If the information on the COE is found to be inconsistent with the re-interview and/or found to be inaccurate, the COE is rejected and the family is deemed ineligible for services under Migrant Education and advised that they do not qualify for services. The family is advised immediately of the disqualification and the family's copy of the Certificate of Eligibility is handed over to them. For those cases in which the COE is rejected, the ID&R Coordinator follows-up with the Community Liaison and Recruiter to clarify any potential misunderstandings about eligibility guidelines.

A quality control sheet (Basic Interview Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form) is used to record the results of the audit (re-interview) visit. This quality control form is completed by the ID&R Coordinator, then attached and filed with the original COE.

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

Throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator (a single person acting at the State level), follows a protocol of "pulling" COEs on a random sample basis to review and verify the information in the Student Database against the COE; when entering information from the COE Update Forms into the Database, spot checks are implemented, such as a review of family and child unique numbers, and other data that has already been entered into the database; and on a daily basis manual confirmation on the eligibility expiration date of all students is completed. In addition, at the MMEP Regional Offices, the Records Clerks are also reviewing COE data against COE "update data" for accuracy on an on-going basis.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The final steps taken by the Pupil Records Coordinator are (1) to audit a sample of student records and pull the COEs to confirm the eligibility through an examination of the "hard copy" documentation and (2) through the system's built-in programs of "finds" and "sorts", to try to replicate the student counts by using different methodologies.

All summer services provided to eligible students through MEP-funding is provided by the MMEP. Information that is reviewed throughout the year is contained in the COEs and in the MMEP permission forms. The standard procedure for identifying the records to be included in the count relies on calculation fields in the student database which flag records that meet specific criteria via boolean operations on data in fields from the student database as well as fields from other related databases. For example one of the set of flag fields used in executing the Category 1 eligibility count, marks a record if the child's LQM was within three years of the beginning of the report period and if a termination date for that child exists, only if the termination occurred after the beginning of the report period.

One strategy used to check the accuracy of that flag is to find all student records with an LQM that falls within the acceptable range for the report year. This group of records is then sorted using the flag field as well as the termination date field and any irregularities can be observed by examining each record. Although this process seems cumbersome, the sort accelerates the process. There will be a series of records, which represent active students with no termination date and, if the flag is observed to be behaving properly, these records may be dispensed with rather quickly. Similarly those records having termination dates after the beginning of the report period should also be flagged and this can rapidly be confirmed. The remaining records should not be flagged and should represent records with termination dates prior to the beginning of the report period. Due to the sort order, the borders for each series are predictable and can be readily identified. Those records in proximity to the borders may be examined more carefully for irregularities, such as unexpected flags or absence of flags. After the found set is satisfactorily examined the omitted records are sorted and examined similarly. Any flagged records in this set would indicate the existence of false positives in which an LQM would be outside of the acceptable three-year range. This is just one example of how a series of finds and sorts combined with scanning of individual records are used to confirm the validity of the compiled data.

On a semi-monthly basis throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator generates a child count report and submits it to the State Director. This report is reviewed by the State Director and the Regional Directors and compared against previous child counts and recruitment targets.

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.

As a result of Massachusetts' statewide re-interviewing initiative in 2006, the MMEP has taken steps to refine and improve upon the quality control exercised over the recruitment and identification of eligible migrant students. The revised framework for monitoring the accuracy of our work is detailed below.

Briefly described, the new framework introduces an additional layer of oversight during the work of recruiting eligible migrant children. Instead of leaving quality control exclusively in the hands of the MMEP Support Center, each region will now call upon "verifiers" to assist in the process. Verifiers will review the paperwork of the COE, confer with Regional Directors, and then together sign off on the accuracy and thoroughness of the COEs being submitted to the Support Center. The objective here, in addition, to having an extra set of "eyes" to review the paperwork is to proactively identify any potential errors and/or misidentified families well before they are declared eligible. In so doing, verifiers will also free additional time for Support Center personnel to conduct more face-to-face re-interviews of families.

The need for more face-to-face re-interviews was one of the many recommendations to surface in the Statewide Director's Re-interviewing Report to OME in 2006.

The flow chart outlined in the "Conceptual Framework" calls for CLs to submit their COEs to a verifier who will then use MMEPs existing standards for quality control to check the COEs for accuracy.

In addition to making use of these standards, Verifiers will also complete the Regional COE Verification Form, attaching it to the COE, once reviewed. Finally, after conferring with CLs, as needed, verifiers will then confer once again with the Regional Directors before he/she signs off on the COE and sends it to the Support Center.

COEs submitted by the Regional Directors will then undergo a process of "validation" by the ID& R Coordinator and staff at the Support Center. Validation activities will, among other things, consist of telephone checks of schools and employers, and face-to-face re-interviews on a systematic basis throughout each school year. In the event that a COE and/or family is discovered to be ineligible for service, Support Staff will send a "MMEP Failure to Validate Form" (and other documents) back to the Regional Director and Verifier, informing them of the change in status. MMEP continues to strengthen the comprehensive quality control training program launched in 2007. Components 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.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts nor the underlying eligibility determinations upon which the counts are based.