

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

MAINE



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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

Maine

Address:

23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0023

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Wanda Monthey

Telephone: 207-624-6831

Fax: 207-624-6821

e-mail: wanda.monthey@maine.gov

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

Wanda Monthey

Thursday, April 22, 2010, 1:20:11 PM

Signature

Date

This section of the 2008-2009 CSPR was certified by Charlotte Ellis -charlotte.ellis@maine.gov -207-624-6808

**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.

Maine adopted the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) academic content standards in mathematics and reading/language arts during the school year 2008-09 for implementation and assessment administration in 2009-10. Maine also developed alternate academic content standards linked to these NECAP standards on the same timeline.

Maine revised their science academic content standards in 2007 for implementation in 2008-09. Maine also developed alternate academic content standards on the same timeline.

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.

Maine has adopted the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) assessments and academic achievement standards in mathematics and reading/language arts at grades 3-8 beginning in school year 2009-10.

Due to the adoption of NECAP academic content standards, Maine has adjusted their Maine High School Assessment components in mathematics and reading/language arts to consist solely of the SAT beginning in school year 2009-10. The Maine Technical Advisory Committee determined that there was no longer a need to augment the mathematics portion of the SAT based on an alignment study of the SAT to the NECAP content standards. The Technical Committee is currently reviewing the need to reset academic achievement standards.

Maine's alternate assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts for school year 2009-10 have been revised to assess the alternate academic content standards linked to the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) academic content standards. New alternate achievement standards will be set in Spring 2010.

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.

Following the adoption of the revised state standards in science -the New Maine Learning Results: Parameters for Essential Instruction (first tested in spring 2009), the State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science have not yet been approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	99,848		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	805		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,659		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	2,789		>97%
Hispanic	1,163		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	93,432		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,798		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,450		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	38,638		>97%
Migratory students	43		>97%
Male	51,403		>97%
Female	48,445		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,036	18.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,279	74.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,245	7.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	16,560	
Comments: Corrections have been submitted but error message still appears.		

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	99,856		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	805		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,659	1,608	96.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2,789		>97%
Hispanic	1,163		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	93,440		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,800		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,450	2,342	95.6
Economically disadvantaged students	38,643		>97%
Migratory students	43		>97%
Male	51,406		>97%
Female	48,450		>97%
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,910	17.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,275	74.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,299	7.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	16,484	
Comments: Corrections have been submitted but error message still appears.		

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	43,674		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	328		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	726		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	1,104	1,063	96.3
Hispanic	522		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	40,994		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,153	6,924	96.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	979	938	95.8
Economically disadvantaged students	15,710		>97%
Migratory students	19		>97%
Male	22,478		>97%
Female	21,196		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,570	22.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,838	69.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	516	7.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	6,924	
Comments: Numbers for children with disabilities match, yet an error message appears.		

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	13,691	9,549	69.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	56	55.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	227	159	70.0
Black, non-Hispanic	414	185	44.7
Hispanic	164	82	50.0
White, non-Hispanic	12,785	9,067	70.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,388	1,095	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	417	186	44.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,846	3,397	58.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	66.7
Male	7,069	5,033	71.2
Female	6,622	4,516	68.2
Comments: Maine has so few migrant students that a change of one student results in a validation issues warning.			

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	13,689	8,909	65.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	65	64.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	226	150	66.4
Black, non-Hispanic	410	171	41.7
Hispanic	164	83	50.6
White, non-Hispanic	12,788	8,440	66.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,388	861	36.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	411	162	39.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5,845	3,096	53.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	66.7
Male	7,067	4,274	60.5
Female	6,622	4,635	70.0
Comments: Maine has so few migrant students that a change of one student results in a validation issues warning.			

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: Maine does not assess science at grade 3. The state's elementary science assessment occurs in grade 5.			

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	13,746	9,110	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	124	73	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	227	154	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	416	192	46.2
Hispanic	148	90	60.8
White, non-Hispanic	12,831	8,601	67.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,364	960	40.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	373	159	42.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,788	3,139	54.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	50.0
Male	7,105	4,736	66.7
Female	6,641	4,374	65.9
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as American Indian, Black, Hispanic or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	13,736	9,722	70.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	124	75	60.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	223	159	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	409	218	53.3
Hispanic	148	98	66.2
White, non-Hispanic	12,832	9,172	71.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,366	1,012	42.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	361	164	45.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5,781	3,443	59.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	66.7
Male	7,101	4,758	67.0
Female	6,635	4,964	74.8
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as American Indian, Black, Hispanic or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Maine moved the science assessment from grade 4 to grade 5 in 2008-09. Maine does not assess science at grade 4.			

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,144	9,275	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	51	46.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	258	177	68.6
Black, non-Hispanic	393	168	42.8
Hispanic	172	90	52.3
White, non-Hispanic	13,211	8,789	66.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,455	933	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	370	143	38.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,819	3,106	53.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	37.5
Male	7,209	4,761	66.0
Female	6,935	4,514	65.1
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Asian or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,135	9,416	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	53	48.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	253	173	68.4
Black, non-Hispanic	388	179	46.1
Hispanic	172	97	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,212	8,914	67.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,454	759	30.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	359	131	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	5,815	3,089	53.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	37.5
Male	7,204	4,580	63.6
Female	6,931	4,836	69.8
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Asian or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,137	7,904	55.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	43	39.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	257	145	56.4
Black, non-Hispanic	389	131	33.7
Hispanic	173	71	41.0
White, non-Hispanic	13,208	7,514	56.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,451	813	33.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	366	89	24.3
Economically disadvantaged students	5,812	2,553	43.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	25.0
Male	7,206	4,258	59.1
Female	6,931	3,646	52.6
Comments: Maine moved the science assessment from grade 4 to grade 5 in 2008-09. Science academic achievement standards at grade 5 were set for the first time in 2009.			

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	14,156	7,623	53.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	128	43	33.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	212	140	66.0
Black, non-Hispanic	415	128	30.8
Hispanic	178	66	37.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,223	7,246	54.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,426	626	25.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	338	90	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,725	2,278	39.8
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	50.0
Male	7,351	4,080	55.5
Female	6,805	3,543	52.1
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Hispanic or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,150	9,991	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	127	68	53.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	210	156	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	412	209	50.7
Hispanic	177	106	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	13,224	9,452	71.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,423	794	32.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	330	140	42.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5,724	3,300	57.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	25.0
Male	7,343	4,830	65.8
Female	6,807	5,161	75.8
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Hispanic or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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: Maine does not assess science at grade 6.			

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	14,322	8,231	57.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	122	47	38.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	259	176	68.0
Black, non-Hispanic	421	134	31.8
Hispanic	144	68	47.2
White, non-Hispanic	13,376	7,806	58.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,391	558	23.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	328	79	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5,436	2,310	42.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	50.0
Male	7,256	4,060	56.0
Female	7,066	4,171	59.0
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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	14,314	11,217	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	121	78	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	254	210	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	415	248	59.8
Hispanic	144	100	69.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,380	10,581	79.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,391	940	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	316	140	44.3
Economically disadvantaged students	5,430	3,612	66.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	62.5
Male	7,251	5,284	72.9
Female	7,063	5,933	84.0
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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: Maine does not assess science at grade 7.			

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	14,653	7,680	52.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	115	42	36.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	234	140	59.8
Black, non-Hispanic	371	114	30.7
Hispanic	191	76	39.8
White, non-Hispanic	13,742	7,308	53.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,424	439	18.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	342	83	24.3
Economically disadvantaged students	5,377	1,948	36.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	16.7
Male	7,528	3,832	50.9
Female	7,125	3,848	54.0
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Asian, Hispanic or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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	14,659	10,407	71.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	66	56.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	232	165	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	366	185	50.6
Hispanic	188	124	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	13,756	9,867	71.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,434	714	29.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	331	129	39.0
Economically disadvantaged students	5,380	3,017	56.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	50.0
Male	7,530	4,948	65.7
Female	7,129	5,459	76.6
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Asian, Hispanic or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,432	8,948	62.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	115	55	47.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	231	148	64.1
Black, non-Hispanic	362	129	35.6
Hispanic	186	102	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	13,538	8,514	62.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,390	670	28.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	336	81	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5,280	2,449	46.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	16.7
Male	7,430	4,671	62.9
Female	7,002	4,277	61.1
Comments: Science academic achievement standards were reset in 2009. Maine has so few students identified as Asian, Hispanic or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,377	5,992	41.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	96	18	18.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	217	112	51.6
Black, non-Hispanic	312	48	15.4
Hispanic	151	42	27.8
White, non-Hispanic	13,601	5,772	42.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,098	256	12.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	240	36	15.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,249	1,096	25.8
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	20.0
Male	7,478	3,213	43.0
Female	6,899	2,779	40.3
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Hispanic, LEP or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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	14,069	6,925	49.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	92	27	29.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	209	95	45.4
Black, non-Hispanic	305	80	26.2
Hispanic	145	54	37.2
White, non-Hispanic	13,318	6,669	50.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,014	331	16.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	229	24	10.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,075	1,376	33.8
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	50.0
Male	7,312	3,358	45.9
Female	6,757	3,567	52.8
Comments: Maine has so few students identified as Hispanic, LEP, or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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	14,215	5,785	40.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	92	14	15.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	215	98	45.6
Black, non-Hispanic	307	62	20.2
Hispanic	146	37	25.3
White, non-Hispanic	13,455	5,574	41.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,055	303	14.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	234	25	10.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,194	1,126	26.8
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	40.0
Male	7,390	3,408	46.1
Female	6,825	2,377	34.8
Comments: Science academic achievement standards were reset in 2009. Maine has so few students identified as Hispanic, LEP or Migratory that a small change in the numbers of students results in a validation issues warning.			

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	632	409	64.7
Districts	226	224	99.1
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	421	315	74.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	24	16	66.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	397	299	75.3
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
209	207	99.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
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.

In addition to enlisting the support of an outside expert to facilitate the change process, this school implemented a "teaming" approach which created cross discipline teams. The intent was to 1) gain greater understanding of curricular intersections across disciplines, 2) to provide avenues for directed discussions related to student needs, and 3) to develop professional learning communities aimed at expanding instructional strategies, standards and expectations for learning.

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) ²
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.

SEA Title I staff provide ongoing technical assistance for districts identified to improvement. This support includes reviewing data to identify common issues, root causes for achievement challenges, successful strategies and initiatives. Technical assistance also includes a review of activities planned for professional development and parental involvement. Improvement efforts undertaken at any Title I schools in improvement status are reviewed to ensure consistency in programming.

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: There are currently no districts in corrective action status.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	13	6
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	11/1/09
---	---------

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	7,042	7,949
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	3,230	3,505
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	45.9	44.1
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	7,020	7,780
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	4,137	4,452
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	58.9	57.2
Comments: The numbers include students from 5 schools that exited improvement status, but received funds as part of their support year.		

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	18
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	4
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	15

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

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	Includes 2 & 5. No school employed a single strategy.	3	0	1	A	
2		0	0	0	D	No comment
3		0	0	0	D	No comment
4		0	0	0	D	No comment
5		0	0	0	D	No comment
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1 and 2	9	1	2	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 1, 2, 3	17	4	13	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 1, 2, 3, 5	8	1	1	A	
Comments: All schools employed multiple strategies, as outlined above. Numbers in column 4 include schools that exited AYP status in 2007-08 and recieved funding as part of their support year.						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MDOE CIPS improvement consultants meet on a regular basis to discuss school plans, receive professional development, and share effective improvement strategies. This information is then shared directly with school level improvement teams.

When appropriate and to limit the disruptions created by travel, webinars are used to disseminate information which is common to multiple schools (i.e required communications, CIPS process, funding questions). The sessions are all posted on the MDOE/NCLB website, providing opportunities for school access the information if and when needed.

A CIPS principal's network was also established to provide opportunities for school leaders to meet together to share successes, challenges, and to participate in activities designed to develop leadership skills.

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During 2008-2009, 1003 (g) funds were predominately used to provide training and materials for MDOE school improvement consultants. Training focused on the "Correlates of Effective schools" as outlined by Lawrence Lazotte. The consultants also participated in book studies related to improvement topics. Books reviewed including Annual Growth, Catch up Growth and Ahead of the Curve. These discussions allowed consultants to become familiar with resources that could then be recommended to school level teams. Training related to data studies was also provided. As an result of this initial data training, more extensive training using the Data Coach's Guide by Nancy Love is scheduled for this year. The funds needed for evaluation activities are taken from Title I 1003 (a).

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.

In 2008-09, there were no actions taken for school improvement purposes that were supported with funds other than those provided by 1003 (a) or 1003 (g). There is , however, collaboration with other state and federal programs, such as title III or IDEA, to ensure effective and comprehensive implementation of improvement strategies that address the needs of all students.

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	10,363
Applied to transfer	N<10
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	N<10

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	\$ 0

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	20

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	2,454
Applied for supplemental educational services	109
Received supplemental educational services	109
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	\$ 106,137
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	54,561	52,636	96.5	1,925	3.5
All elementary classes	19,352	18,944	97.9	408	2.1
All secondary classes	35,209	33,692	95.7	1,517	4.3

Not all of Maine's Career and Technical Education Schools are reported in our data due to many of them not being responsible for delivering "core academic content", and thus not falling under the "HQT" requirements for teachers of such. Thus "all schools" may not show as having been reported when compared to EdFacts.

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 State of Maine counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	32.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	23.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	12.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Generally LEAs report that these classes are taught by teachers working toward highly qualified status in a reassigned content. Thus they HAVE demonstrated HQT in one area, but not in all areas assigned.

	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)	37.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	18.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	13.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Generally LEAs report that these classes are taught by teachers working toward highly qualified status in a reassigned content. Thus they HAVE demonstrated HQT in one area, but not in all areas assigned.

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	4,678	4,519	96.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	6,782	6,674	98.4
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	4,581	4,407	96.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	10,085	9,732	96.5

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	58.5	30.7
Poverty metric used	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. The percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program was for this calculation.	
Secondary schools	48.3	26.8
Poverty metric used	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. The percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program was for this calculation.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

1. *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.*
2. *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.*
3. *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.*
4. *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	French
Yes	Two-way immersion	French
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Passamaquoddy
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Push-in

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	4,562
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.	3,885
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
Somali	1,524
Spanish; Castilian	508
French	322
Central Khmer	266
Arabic	258

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	3,980
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	582
Total	4,562
Comments: Of those 582 not tested, 152 were enrolled after the testing cycle ended; 99 were not tested in all domains including students who are deaf. A majority of those not tested in all domains were high school students. Dept identified this during verification and will be monitoring subgrantees.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	191
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	4.8
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,488
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	397
Total	3,885
Comments: Of those 397 not tested, 134 were enrolled after the testing cycle ended; 88 were not tested in all domains including those students who are deaf. 59 of those not tested in all domains were high school students whose participation is an issue but is being addressed	
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.	198

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	2,844	62.0	1,937	49.90
ELP attainment	706	15.4	705	18.20
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English only
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)
English only
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)
English only
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
69	10	79
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
79	61	77.2	18
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
79	71	89.9	8
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
36	26	72.2	10
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	13
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	10
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	12
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	10
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	13
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	1
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	0
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</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
352	7	1

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. only 7 of the 352 immigrant students DID NOT receive Title III language instructional services

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	93
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	31

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	13	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	13	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	13	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	13	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	9	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	13	1,578
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	13	214
PD provided to principals	13	116
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	13	96
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	13	233
PD provided to community based organization personnel	13	136
Total	13	2,373

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	10/06/08	98
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.

allowing Title I paid accounting staff to incorporate and coordinate Title III payments into the payment process.

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 count for Maine is again zero (0) for 2008-09. Sources of Data: (1) Maine School incidence of Prohibited Behavior Data on expulsions collected during 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09 academic school years. (2) Maine Gun-Free Schools Reports collected during 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years.	

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	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	83.0
Hispanic	77.0
White, non-Hispanic	83.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32.0
Limited English proficient	89.0
Economically disadvantaged	72.0
Migratory students	66.0
Male	81.0
Female	86.0
Comments:	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4.8
Hispanic	6.1
White, non-Hispanic	4.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6.2
Limited English proficient	3.2
Economically disadvantaged	1.2
Migratory students	4.3
Male	4.8
Female	3.5
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	296	296
LEAs with subgrants	3	3
Total	299	299
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)	N<10	
K	61	17
1	86	29
2	61	17
3	62	17
4	58	16
5	49	18
6	55	12
7	49	14
8	57	12
9	56	22
10	124	40
11	134	39
12	156	30
Ungraded		
Total	1,017	283
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	292	108
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	629	171
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	30	N<10
Hotels/Motels	66	N<10
Total	1,017	283
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	17
1	29
2	17
3	17
4	16
5	18
6	12
7	14
8	22
9	81
10	108
11	77
12	63
Ungraded	54
Total	545
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	383
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	79
Limited English proficient students	63
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	3
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
Transportation	3
Early childhood programs	0
Assistance with participation in school programs	3
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
Coordination between schools and agencies	3
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

employment,budgeting,housing support, recreational support, assistance with legal proceedings

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

access to medical assistance and state programs ie TANF,MECare, food stamps

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	13	N<10
4	13	N<10
5	15	N<10
6	N<10	N<10
7	N<10	N<10
8	N<10	N<10
High School	14	N<10
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	13	N<10
4	12	N<10
5	16	10
6	N<10	N<10
7	N<10	N<10
8	N<10	N<10
High School	19	N<10
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	22
K	18
1	27
2	25
3	20
4	14
5	25
6	30
7	19
8	22
9	28
10	21
11	23
12	13
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	64
Total	372
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 percentage increase of the Category 1 Child Count from 2007-08 (321) and 2008-2009 (372) is a direct result of more extensive and better coordinated identification and recruitment efforts. Beginning in June of 2009 (and falling at the end of the reporting period) the Maine MEP received additional ID&R support from a contracted provider. The number of recruiters on the ground during the summer blueberry harvest increase, as did the thoroughness of the recruiting efforts.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	12
1	18
2	21
3	10
4	N<10
5	15
6	21
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	129
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 Category 2 Child Count decreased in 2008-2009 from 161 in 2001-2008 to 129. Given the small identified eligible population in Maine, this drop represents a very significant decrease. The day program during the blueberry harvest received fewer students than in recent prior years, although the past three years have regularly declined. The most likely reason for this decline was a shift in the population demographic in general for this harvest season. At least two factors likely contributed: 1) an exceptionally late harvest due to extremely wet, cold weather discouraged some Canadian families with school-aged children from travelling because the season encroached on the regular academic year; 2) Increased employer vigilance to immigration issues resulted in a shift in worker population at one of the growers and regular, returning workers were replaced with new workers who were able to show permission to work. The growers themselves and the camp lease holders acknowledge a dramatic decrease in the number of regularly returning families to the harvest this past season.

Recruiting efforts were increased this year, however, and the result was an increase in identified out-of-school youth, particularly among the young, Latino workers. The day school experienced a slight increase in enrollment of Latino children as well.

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.

The MDOE MEP used data queries from the state's MIS2000 database to generate the reports necessary to establish child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2, 2008-09 CSPR. The state's migrant child counts for the last year 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.

How was the child count data collected?

Child count data were collected by state MEP staff and temporary recruiting staff.

What data were collected?

Personal Data: male and female parent/guardian first and last name; relationship; legal male and female parent last and first name; current address; current phone number (if available); work phone number (if available); permanent address; permanent phone; MIS2000 ID; student name first/middle/last1/last2/suffix grade; birth date; sex; age; place of birth (city/state/country), grade, multibirth flag.

Eligibility information:

Origin and destination of move qualifying move: 'From' (District, City, State, Country); 'To' (School District, city, State, country); QA Date (QAD); Current Residency Date; whether the child moved with or joined parents or moved on his/her own; name of qualifying worker; relation to child; economic necessity in order to obtain qualifying work; temporary/seasonal work; agriculture or fishing industry; specific qualifying activity; personal subsistence (if applicable); reason for temporary (if applicable); basis of temporary determination (if applicable); additional comments (if applicable); signature of parent/guardian or eligible student (if qualifying worker); signature of recruiter; eligibility verification date and signature by state MEP Director.

School and MEP project information:

current school or project; date of enrollment; type of services; total days enrolled; total days present; special services; withdrawal date; LEP or Special Education designation, priority for services; continuation of services; graduation and drop out data is extracted from the state student data system.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

Primary student data were collected on the COEs by MEP staff and temporary recruiters hired and trained by MEP staff and/or ESCORT staff for seasonal recruitment. The data were collected by means of personal interviews with parents and/or guardians during the school year and summer in Maine. Recruiters visited worker camps, crop sites, processing plants, homes, and schools to conduct interviews with potentially eligible families and workers. In some cases, preliminary phone interviews were conducted by recruiters to follow-up on school surveys to determine likely eligibility in order to schedule a personal interview to complete the COE.

Two state recruiters, 8 contracted recruiters through ESCORT, and two additional temporary workers (hired just for the blueberry harvest) carried out the interviews. Summer interviews were conducted by teams of two recruiters and COEs were cross-checked within the teams. COEs were then reviewed by the ESCORT field coordinator and submitted to the MEP Director for verification. Any cases with questions, inconsistencies, or missing data were referred back to the Field Coordinator for clarification. Clarified COEs were then verified by the MEP Director. Upon verification, COEs were entered into the MEP database (MIS2000) by one temporary summer staff person, a contracted assistant through ESCORT, a contracted data management assistant, and in isolated cases, the MEP Director.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

Data were collected at the time of enrollment in a MEP program and upon identification of eligible workers during state-wide recruiting efforts throughout the year. Withdrawal data were collected at the time of outbound moves or, in the case of MEP projects, at the end of the project.

The same methods were used for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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.

Child count data points are input into MIS2000 as soon as practical once the COE is finalized, reviewed, and approved by the Director of the MEP. The COE is the primary source for data-points in the local MIS2000 database. Additional data are collected on field scripts by the recruiters at the time of the interview or accessed through Maine's student information system (Infinite Campus). Once all verified COEs are input for the current reporting period, the data are extracted from the MIS2000 system for use in CSPR reporting. This 'snap report' from the MIS2000 database is generated to capture the population in a spreadsheet as defined in section 1.10.3.3.

For the 2008-09 MEP data, MEP staff reviewed each COE record for the reporting period and cross-referenced with both summer attendance sheets and the State student information system to ensure the students in the data were present in Maine to determine Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts; presence was based on QAD, COE date or enrollment date during the reporting period.

Updates to data:

Updates to any data-point contained either in the spreadsheet used for CSPR reporting or to the MIS2000 database are reviewed and approved by the state Director of the MEP. Updates may occur based on information gathered either via follow-up phone calls to parents by The current data maintenance practices and procedures continue to be reviewed and revised. Attempts were made this past year to synchronize the data elements within MIS2000 and the primary state database through Infinite Campus. The state Office of Information Technology, however, was not able to complete the action prior to the 2008-09 CSPR submission. The primary data management goal in the upcoming year is to ensure that the two systems can interface without having to maintain duplicate data in disparate systems.

Future improvements to data quality:

The MDOE MEP continues to improve its data collection and management procedures by:

- o Revising and clarifying data collection tools and procedures for the MEP and participating LEAs;
- o Review of data elements (definitions & management) in MIS2000;
- o Developing a schedule of regular data maintenance;
- o Building on the communications with LEAs to increase the accuracy and time relevance of student data.
- o Aligning state MEP data and Minimum Data Elements (MDEs) to MSIX
- o Independent, third-party review/validation of all data-points in CSPR reporting

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 Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on review of attendance sheets.

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.

Eligibility:

The MEP used MIS2000 to generate the initial report for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts for 2008-09. The report produced a complete list of all students eligible during the reporting period. To be eligible for migrant services, there must be a qualifying move within 36 months of the first day of the reporting period. The first day of the reporting period for the 2008-09 report is 09/01/2008. Therefore, the 36 month window begins on 09/01/2005. The period ends on 08/31/2009. Once the date window is established, a query is generated from MIS2000 based on Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) between 09/01/2005 and 08/31/2009.

A report was run to include all the necessary data points to required to complete both parts of the CSPR. The following is a list of data fields extracted for the initial CSPR report: Student ID, Last Name, First Name, Middle Name, Sex, Birth Date, Race, Birth City, Birth State, Birth Country, Qa Date, Coe Date, Eligible, COE ID, Res Date, Currentaddress, Current City, Current State Code, Zip, Phone, Curf Name 1, Curl Name 1, Curl Name 2, Curl Name 2, Homebaseaddr, Homebase City, Homebase State Code, Homebasezip, Homebase Country Code, From City, From State Code, From Country Code, To City, To State Code, Movedreason, Seasonaltemp Flag, Work Type, Worker Name, Facility Id, Facility Name, Enroll Date, Type _, Grade, Days Enr, Days Pres, Term Type, Term Date, Withdraw Date, School Year, Counselingyn, Advocacy, ComputerskillsYN, Dental, EDSuppliesYN, EnglishLanguageArtsYN, HealthSafteyYN, MathematicsYN, Nutrition, NeedsAssess, OtherYN, Other2Name, ReadingYN, ScienceYN, SocialStudiesHistoryYN, PupilTransport, Eslep, Specialed, Priorityforservice, Continuationofservice, Referredtootherservices, Receivedservice,

The following data elements are accessed through the State Student Information System: Dropout, GED, State Assessment, School data. LEP and IDEA data from MIS2000 are cross validated with the state student database.

If the "eligible" field in MIS2000 is not populated with a "Y" (indicating the child was verified as eligible), the COE is physically checked to determine eligibility. If the child is eligible based on physical examination of the COE, the database and spreadsheet are updated accordingly.

Age/Grade:

Age was calculated as of 8/31/09. The initial data report selected students whose birthdate was less than or equal to the report period end-date and those whose twenty-second birthdate was greater than or equal to the start-date of the reporting period. Children under the age of 3 as of 8/31/09 were not included in either Category 1 or Category 2 counts, however individual data was collected for use in reporting for the CSPR Part II. Grade was based on reported grade during summer program for Canadian residents and enrollment date as of 8/31/09 for Maine enrolled students. Out of School Youth are indicated as grade = OS and a comment is made in the database to document the last grade completed.

Residence:

The initial data report filtered the following data points for a date within the reporting period: enrollment date, QAD, residence date, termination date, funding date, withdraw date, or COE date. Additional parameters specified that the termination date hold a value of null or greater than or equal to the start-date of the reporting period. Attendance rosters from migrant projects were also review to verify presence as well as confirmation of an Infinite Campus enrollment date in a Maine school. Any students who were not verifiably present in the state during the reporting period were removed from the primary student list.

Removal of Duplicate Records or Multiple Enrollments:

The report was extracted from the MIS2000 database into an Excel workbook so that all individual records could be reviewed and any duplicate records or multiple enrollments more easily identified and eliminated. Only the most recent enrollment for each individual student remained on the list. Any found duplicate records are subsequently merged in the database.

Data Validation:

An operational draft of the student report is printed for the MEP Director to review. Any remaining corrections to the spreadsheet are completed and the database updated accordingly. The document / count now becomes the primary document / count utilized for all other data elements reported in the CSPR (for both Parts I and II).

As with the 2007-08 Category 1 and 2 counts, the MEP staff requested that State data staff run a match report to compare MIS2000 data with State Student Information System to verify which eligible migrant students enrolled for at least one day in Maine schools during the reporting period. The resultant matches are included in the Category 1 count. Once final validation is complete, all migrant related data and then sent to EDFacts for CSPR finalization.

For the 2008-09 reporting period, a tandem, independent, third-party number count validation was also utilized to ensure a match and verification of all data-points.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on review of attendance sheets.

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.

During the summer of 2009, the Maine MEP utilized contracted services from SUNY/ESCORT to implement an expanded identification and recruitment effort to establish a current statewide migrant student profile for the purpose of completing the State's comprehensive needs assessment. As part of this outreach effort, the Maine MEP utilized two State seasonal recruiters, two temporary recruiters hired through the staffing contract for school personnel, and 8 recruiters from ESCORT. The two Maine State recruiters were returning staff from 2008. The ESCORT recruiters were full-time recruiters in the states of Florida, Texas, and New York. One of the two temporary staff had prior experience as a recruiter with the Maine MEP.

Training and orientation for all recruiters was provided through ESCORT, in collaboration with the Maine MEP.

Orientation for Maine State and ESCORT recruiters included:

- ? Overview of the Maine Migrant Education Program;
- ? Overview of qualifying agricultural and fishing industries in Maine;
- ? Role of the Maine Project Recruiter;
- ? Review of Maine MEP services;
- ? Overview of typical daily recruiting schedule and routine;
- ? Review of the Maine COE;
- ? Review of documentation and reporting procedures; and,
- ? Overview of logistics and resources.

Orientation for the two temporary recruiters included:

- ? Overview of Migrant Education (including history)
- ? Current regulations
- ? Identifying migrant students and Out-of-School Youth
- ? Completing a COE

The temporary recruiters received 18 hours of training over three days at the beginning of the identification and recruitment efforts during the blueberry harvest. They received 6 hours of training with the ID&R Coordinator and the State seasonal recruiter one day one. They received an additional 6 hours of training on day two, in conjunction with the ESCORT recruiters. The third day of training included practice interviewing in the field.

The SEA uses a standard, triplicate COE to collect consistent data on eligible students. The COE is signed by both recruiter and parent. During the summer of 2009, the COE was reviewed by the ID&R Coordinator before being submitted to the State MEP director for verification. A copy is available for parents and LEAs and the original is filed at the state MEP office.

Each COE completed during the 2008-09 school year via personal interview was reviewed by the state recruiter, temporary staff, an education specialist, or the MEP director. Eligibility was validated by the State Director prior to inclusion in any data counts. If any information seemed unclear or incomplete, the recruiters returned to the field to follow-up with the workers and obtain additional clarifying information. In the event that questions were identified after the close of the Migrant Project, MEP staff followed-up with telephone calls to workers to obtain clarification. At times, questions of eligibility were discussed at the state level with the contracted service provider, ESCORT. In the event that clarification/qualification could not be obtained and there was no resolution prior completing eligibility documentation, the students were not included in the child count.

The Maine MEP currently requires that the person interviewed for the COE sign the document before it is entered into MIS2000.

The State MEP uses a robust quality assurance approach to ensure data quality by contracting an independent, third-party validation of all migrant counts for the 2008-09 CSPR submission. Findings from the validation were sent to the MDOE for correction prior to use in the State's CSPR reporting. Further, the validation process and procedures were documented and a training module created for use in future MEP data quality activities. The final outcome is a verifiable process that produced Category I and Category II data in 2009 that is both

accurate and credible.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEP hired temporary staff in February 2008 to conduct re-interviews for participants in the 2007 summer Blueberry Harvest Program. The Maine MEP did not conduct systematic re-interviews during the 2008-09 reporting period; however, the MEP is scheduling re-interviews during 2010.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Maine MEP continues to evaluate and develop its data management procedures. During the reporting period, information was entered into MIS2000 directly from the COEs by either the Education Specialist II at the State or one of three temporary contracted assistants, following review, verification and validation of student eligibility by the state MEP director. Any questions on individual COEs were investigated by the state director, education specialist, state recruiters, or contracted staff with oversight from the State MEP director. Questions were resolved prior to inclusion in any state counts.

The state of Maine utilizes only one database as its primary data source for all reports -MIS2000. Efforts began in August of 2008, and continue to present, to improve program usage of the MIS2000 software, as well as its ultimate interface with MSIX. The departure of the MEP's principal data manager hindered the data management element of the increased identification and recruitment efforts. These factors required the state MEP to coordinate with outside contractors to assist with data input. The outside contractors received technical assistance from both the Maine MEP Director and the software service provider. Student records were reviewed and supplemental data was inserted by the Maine MEP director and a contracted data management assistant. This review and update process created an opportunity to review data quality and ensure that student eligibility information was accurately input from the COEs and properly linked to existing student records.

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.

MEP procedures require that no COEs are entered into the database until they have been verified by the MEP director as qualified for migrant services. Final reports extracted from the MIS2000 database for inclusion into the CSPR number counts are also verified by the MEP director to ensure accuracy and non-duplication. Any validated changes made to the data in the master spreadsheet are also immediately changed in the MIS2000 database to ensure that counts match and are accurate. This process will be further simplified in the upcoming year as the state invests additional resources and increases interoperability between the MEP desktop d-base and other information management systems. Finally, for the 2008-09 reporting period, Maine had an independent third-party review to validate the data-points included in the CSPR submission.

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.

- ? Conduct both random (10%) and purposeful re-interviews in 2010.
- ? Continue expanded recruiting efforts statewide.
- ? Enhance on-site recruiter training for 2010 blueberry harvest.
- ? Continue improvements to MIS2000 usage and data input, in conjunction with software contractor.
- ? Continue data review with state Data Management Team to streamline the data collection process so the MEP database (MIS2000) and state database (Infinite Campus) can interface
- ? Develop an Administrative Handbook for migrant data management
- ? Continue to have an independent, third-party review and validation of CSPR data points
- ? Advertise, interview and hire an Education Specialist II to address migrant data entry needs.
- ? Identify critical data points necessary for the state migrant database to interface with MSIX

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.

In general, the quality of the data housed in MIS2000 for the Maine MEP has continually improved during this past three years. A filing system was created in 2008 so that the electronic data can be easily verified with reference to original documents (COEs, attendance sheets, enrollment forms, etc.) and vice versa. Procedures for maintaining records were established and documented.

The Maine MEP has a more complete data history on eligible students for this reporting period than in previous submission: student enrollments and services are more completely documented; student race has been entered for all students identified during the reporting period; the contracted service provider for identification and recruitment efforts is refining the student service data collection tool for both summer and regular term students. The state MEP staff continues to obtain technical assistance from MIS2000 staff as needed and continue to work with the software company itself to refine our system and improve the collection and management of the data.

The Maine MEP sought to unify the Migrant student data collection with the State student information system during 2009; however, due to an unexpected contractual complication between the state OIT and the vendor, the MEP was unable to implement this plan. The MEP, therefore, opted to seek assistance from a third party for data analysis. The MEP continues to work with the State Office of Information Technology to create a more streamlined data collection and management system that utilizes existing student data from the State system to supplement the MEP-specific data collection needs of the program.

In terms of the accuracy of reported data for 2008-09, MEP staff has utilized supplemental methods (described above) to ensure that the counts submitted are correct, as well as an independent third-party analysis of our process with CSPR data count validation. The goal is to improve the collection and maintenance of data so that future reports can be generated directly from MIS2000 with less need for additional, record-by-record, manual verification efforts.