

# 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**

**MINNESOTA**



**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:

Minnesota Dept of Ed

Address:

1500 Highway 36 W  
Roseville MN

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Greg Marcus

Telephone: 651-582-8454

Fax: 651-582-8727

e-mail: greg.marcus@state.mn.us

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

Jessie Montano

Friday, March 12, 2010, 1:08:02 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**



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

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

### STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

#### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in Language Arts (2003), Mathematics (2003) and Science (2004) were approved in Section 1 of the peer review process for the state's current set of assessments. Since that time, the following changes have been made or are planned:

- Minnesota's 2003 Mathematics standards were revised in 2007. School districts are required to implement the revised math standards by the 2010-2011 school year. The revised standards help define the mathematics requirements for credit and high school graduation: "three credits [three years] of mathematics, encompassing at least algebra, geometry, statistics, and probability sufficient to satisfy the academic standard" (Minn. Stat. 120B.024 (a)(2)). The revised standards also reflect new requirements in which "students must satisfactorily complete an algebra I credit by the end of eighth grade" (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023, subd. 2(b)(1)); and "students scheduled to graduate in the 2014-2015 school year or later must satisfactorily complete an algebra II credit or its equivalent" in order to graduate from high school (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023, subd. 2(b)(2)).

Minnesota is actively participating in the Common Core State Standards Initiative standards development and feedback process. Minnesota's 2007 standards will be revised to reflect the Common Core standards, assuming the Common Core standards are at least as rigorous as Minnesota's 2007 standards. If this happens, it is expected that the Common Core will represent at least 85% of the state's revised mathematics standards.

- Minnesota's 2003 Language Arts\* standards will be reviewed and revised during the current (2009-2010) school year. School districts will be required to implement the revised language arts standards by the 2012-2013 school year. The revised standards will help define the requirement of "four credits of language arts" for high school graduation (Minn. Stat. § 120B.024 (a)(1)).

Minnesota is actively participating in the Common Core State Standards Initiative standards development and feedback process. Minnesota's 2003 language arts standards will be revised to reflect the Common Core standards, assuming the Common Core standards are at least as rigorous as Minnesota's standards. If this happens, it is expected that the Common Core will represent at least 85% of the state's revised language arts standards.

Minnesota's 2004 Science standards were revised in 2009. School districts are required to implement the revised science standards by the 2011-2012 school year. The revised standards help define the science requirements for credit and high school graduation: "three credits of science in high school, including at least one credit in biology" (MS 120B.024). The revised standards also reflect a new requirement in which "students scheduled to graduate in the 2014-2015 school year or later must satisfactorily complete a chemistry or physics credit [as part of the three-credit requirement]" (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023, subd. 2(d)). Minnesota's revised science standards feature substantive engineering design process standards across the K-12 grade span, consistent with leading states' efforts to address the increased importance of STEM (science, technology, engineering and math in an integrated way) in our modern scientific world.

\* Minnesota's Language Arts standards include reading.

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.

The state plans to revise its assessment system according to the revision cycle identified in state statute 120B.30. The state assessment system must be aligned to the most recent revision of academic standards as described in section 120B.023 in the following manner: mathematics-grades 3 through 8 beginning in the 2010-2011 school year; and high school level beginning in the 2013-2014 school year; and language arts and reading; grades 3 through 8 and high school level beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. The state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards will be revised according to this same cycle. New achievement standards for all tests are expected to be established in the year of implementation. The state's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards is scheduled to be operational in 2010-2011 in grades 5-8 and high school for reading and math. New achievement standards for all tests are expected to be established in the year of implementation.

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.

The state plans to revise its assessment system according to the revision cycle identified in state statute 120B.30. The state assessment system must be aligned to the most recent revision of academic standards as described in section 120B.023 in the following manner: science-grades 5 and 8 and at the high school level beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. The state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards will be revised according to this same cycle. New achievement standards for all tests are expected to be established in the year of implementation.

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	427,788		N<10
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	35,206		N<10
Black, non-Hispanic	40,097		N<10
Hispanic	26,278		N<10
White, non-Hispanic	326,207		N<10
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	59,320		N<10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	30,789		N<10
Economically disadvantaged students	139,295		N<10
Migratory students	749	722	96.4
Male	219,311		N<10
Female	208,477		N<10
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	34,939	60.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,857	29.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,265	10.8
Total	58,061	
<b>Comments: ERROR</b>		

### 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	428,166		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	35,399		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	40,246		>97%
Hispanic	26,610		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	325,911		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	59,902		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	30,977		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	141,004		>97%
Migratory students	785	759	96.7
Male	219,766		>97%
Female	208,400		>97%
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	48,816	83.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,409	5.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,436	11.0
Total	58,661	
<b>Comments: Error</b>		

#### 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	387,853	183,191	47.2
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	30,890	14,666	47.5
Black, non-Hispanic	35,405	16,114	45.5
Hispanic	19,933	10,138	50.9
White, non-Hispanic	301,625	142,273	47.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	51,914	23,800	45.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,822	11,587	53.1
Economically disadvantaged students	113,168	56,325	49.8
Migratory students	636	314	49.4
Male	199,538	93,674	47.0
Female	188,315	89,517	47.5

**Comments: Minnesota's 2009 science assessment participation rate is composed of the following data: The denominators for grade 5 and 8 science assessments are the number of students enrolled in grades 5 and 8. The denominator for the high school life science end of course assesment is the count of students enrolled in the high school. The numerator for the for grade 5 and 8 science assessments are the number of students who participated in the grades 5 and 8 assessments. The numerator for the high school end of course life science assesment is the count of students who participated in the assessment. High school students take the assessment after completing their high school life science course. The life science course might be taken during any of the students four years in high school. Thus, the high school participation rate appears to show approximately one-fourth of the high school enrollment participating. This artificially low high school number suppresses the state's 2009 Science participation rate.**

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.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,458	81.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,734	7.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,662	11.2
Total	23,854	
<b>Comments: Error?</b>		

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,881	47,528	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,381	860	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,998	2,889	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	6,073	3,329	54.8
Hispanic	4,328	2,481	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	44,101	37,969	86.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,395	4,660	55.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,810	2,893	49.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21,402	13,725	64.1
Migratory students	98	40	40.8
Male	30,739	24,354	79.2
Female	29,142	23,174	79.5
<b>Comments: Small changes on a statewide basis in a migrant population.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,796	46,820	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,380	828	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,984	2,738	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,049	3,349	55.4
Hispanic	4,317	2,554	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	44,066	37,351	84.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,361	4,180	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,755	2,752	47.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21,345	13,500	63.3
Migratory students	97	44	45.4
Male	30,686	23,092	75.3
Female	29,110	23,728	81.5
<b>Comments: Small changes on a statewide basis in a migrant population.</b>			

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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
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			
<b>Comments: Minnesota assesses students in grades 5, 8 and HS.</b>			

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**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,392	43,062	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,319	708	53.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,668	2,428	66.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,827	2,585	44.4
Hispanic	4,230	2,026	47.9
White, non-Hispanic	44,348	35,315	79.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,157	4,255	46.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,326	2,222	41.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,855	11,317	54.3
Migratory students	110	39	35.5
Male	30,450	21,833	71.7
Female	28,942	21,229	73.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,332	44,218	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,321	723	54.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,657	2,285	62.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,802	2,866	49.4
Hispanic	4,207	2,071	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	44,345	36,273	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,139	4,227	46.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,267	1,996	37.9
Economically disadvantaged students	20,797	11,815	56.8
Migratory students	114	34	29.8
Male	30,408	21,891	72.0
Female	28,924	22,327	77.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
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			
<b>Comments: Minnesota assesses students in grades 5, 8, and high school.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,234	37,777	63.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,377	583	42.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,608	2,151	59.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,665	1,944	34.3
Hispanic	3,848	1,495	38.9
White, non-Hispanic	44,736	31,604	70.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,672	3,098	35.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,622	1,463	31.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,391	9,028	44.3
Migratory students	120	36	30.0
Male	30,157	19,170	63.6
Female	29,077	18,607	64.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,242	42,803	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,373	736	53.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,604	2,223	61.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,668	2,584	45.6
Hispanic	3,835	1,796	46.8
White, non-Hispanic	44,762	35,464	79.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,678	3,541	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,572	1,517	33.2
Economically disadvantaged students	20,370	11,069	54.3
Migratory students	118	39	33.1
Male	30,157	20,938	69.4
Female	29,085	21,865	75.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,021	26,873	45.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,343	285	21.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,620	1,245	34.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,659	995	17.6
Hispanic	3,841	727	18.9
White, non-Hispanic	44,558	23,621	53.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,602	2,403	27.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,632	420	9.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20,266	5,268	26.0
Migratory students	120	14	11.7
Male	30,059	14,840	49.4
Female	28,962	12,033	41.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,770	37,141	62.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,339	510	38.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,667	2,210	60.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,523	1,761	31.9
Hispanic	3,866	1,373	35.5
White, non-Hispanic	45,375	31,287	69.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,333	2,393	28.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,214	1,218	28.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19,913	8,407	42.2
Migratory students	108	28	25.9
Male	30,669	18,796	61.3
Female	29,101	18,345	63.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,703	43,360	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,339	684	51.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,651	2,243	61.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,498	2,692	49.0
Hispanic	3,861	1,885	48.8
White, non-Hispanic	45,354	35,856	79.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,316	3,117	37.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,160	1,297	31.2
Economically disadvantaged students	19,877	10,692	53.8
Migratory students	108	44	40.7
Male	30,635	21,231	69.3
Female	29,068	22,129	76.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
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			
<b>Comments: Minnesota assesses students in grades 5, 8, and high school.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,211	36,806	61.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,328	460	34.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,648	2,103	57.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,380	1,643	30.5
Hispanic	3,493	1,216	34.8
White, non-Hispanic	46,362	31,384	67.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,969	2,134	26.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,693	913	24.7
Economically disadvantaged students	19,373	7,789	40.2
Migratory students	99	22	22.2
Male	30,826	19,076	61.9
Female	29,385	17,730	60.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,195	39,150	65.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,324	564	42.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,644	1,994	54.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,367	2,040	38.0
Hispanic	3,472	1,349	38.9
White, non-Hispanic	46,388	33,203	71.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,967	2,467	31.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,635	710	19.5
Economically disadvantaged students	19,363	8,674	44.8
Migratory students	99	21	21.2
Male	30,810	18,985	61.6
Female	29,385	20,165	68.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
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			
<b>Comments: Minnesota tests students in grades 5, 8 and high school.</b>			

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**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,252	35,731	58.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,296	398	30.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,590	1,980	55.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,420	1,369	25.3
Hispanic	3,376	1,021	30.2
White, non-Hispanic	47,570	30,963	65.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,233	1,839	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,507	739	21.1
Economically disadvantaged students	18,969	6,866	36.2
Migratory students	87	15	17.2
Male	31,484	18,275	58.1
Female	29,768	17,456	58.6
<b>Comments: Small changes on a statewide basis in a migrant population.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,192	41,115	67.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,299	563	43.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,578	1,968	55.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,409	2,130	39.4
Hispanic	3,352	1,403	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	47,554	35,051	73.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,217	2,546	31.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,445	786	22.8
Economically disadvantaged students	18,931	8,761	46.3
Migratory students	84	28	33.3
Male	31,452	19,671	62.5
Female	29,740	21,444	72.1
<b>Comments: Small changes on a statewide basis in a migrant population</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,400	25,957	43.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,254	263	21.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,553	1,165	32.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,292	788	14.9
Hispanic	3,336	603	18.1
White, non-Hispanic	46,965	23,138	49.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,979	1,580	19.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,466	225	6.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,603	4,351	23.4
Migratory students	83	7	8.4
Male	30,977	14,014	45.2
Female	29,423	11,943	40.6
<b>Comments: Small changes on a statewide basis in a migrant population.</b>			

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	63,883	26,382	41.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,095	207	18.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,670	1,294	35.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,212	571	11.0
Hispanic	2,650	425	16.0
White, non-Hispanic	51,256	23,885	46.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,283	868	11.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,150	335	10.6
Economically disadvantaged students	16,437	3,331	20.3
Migratory students	85	N<10	
Male	32,554	14,149	43.5
Female	31,329	12,233	39.1
<b>Comments: Mn's LEP population is growing.</b>			

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	64,951	48,347	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,252	631	50.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,763	2,215	58.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,486	2,380	43.4
Hispanic	3,084	1,485	48.2
White, non-Hispanic	51,366	41,636	81.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,963	2,910	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,587	1,002	27.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,373	9,695	52.8
Migratory students	121	57	47.1
Male	33,376	24,373	73.0
Female	31,575	23,974	75.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,907	31,785	49.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,141	268	23.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,924	1,500	38.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,150	922	17.9
Hispanic	2,953	707	23.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,739	28,388	56.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,261	1,523	21.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,479	413	11.9
Economically disadvantaged students	17,588	4,972	28.3
Migratory students	110	23	20.9
Male	32,693	16,526	50.6
Female	31,214	15,259	48.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	2,302	1,066	46.3
Districts	543	211	38.9
<b>Comments: Minnesota began measuring type 50, 55, 70-79 facilities for AYP during 2009. Previously students in these facilities (whose primary purpose is care and treatment) were only measured at the district and state level.</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. 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	862	426	49.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	278	75	27.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	584	351	60.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. 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
434	168	38.7
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 Year 1, School Improvement 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	12
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
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	3
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
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	4
<b>Comments:</b>	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action )
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

2008-2009 was the third year of implementation in which the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE), Division of School Improvement changed its Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) support model to one of a regionally based Statewide System of Support (SSOS). This change capitalizes on a regional delivery model that provides technical assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and schools as required under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. The development of this model was based on research of best practices from other states as well as an extensive review of the legislation, regulations and guidance to ensure compliance.

For school year 2008-09, the AYP Coordinators' first priority was on-site consultation and professional development for (schools and) districts in corrective action (and schools in stages of restructuring). The second priority, as outlined in the USDE Guidance, was working with districts In Need of Improvement. AYP Coordinators were active participating members on district improvement (or leadership) teams. A central focus was the development of or updates to district improvement plans. High-quality and sustained professional development continued to be delivered by service cooperatives to build district capacity. The regional service delivery model was purposeful to increase district capacity to lead and provide structure to ensure that schools were effective in increasing student achievement, especially for identified student groups. Professional development services were customized to meet the needs of eligible AYP districts (and schools), especially Corrective Action districts. Professional development funded through NCLB programs reflected the statutory set of principles that apply to Section 9101 (34) of NCLB.

All AYP improvement plans for districts were submitted by the 90 day deadline as outlined under Title I Part A (November 10, 2009). The MDE AYP Team reviewed (163) plans submitted by AYP districts from across the state including (26) districts in Corrective Action (200809). Districts in Corrective Action -Appendix C of the district improvement plan (DIP) were strengthened by the MDE for Title I districts in Corrective Action (3.1, 3.2). Corrective Action requires a significant intervention designed to remedy the persistent inability to make AYP for all students to become proficient in reading and mathematics. Corrective Action districts were required to reserve a minimum of 2 percent of their Title I allocation for a programmatic set-aside (in addition to the 10% professional development set-aside required under NCLB). Districts were required to expend programmatic set-aside funds and implement improvement plan activities and services during the year of identification. Districts with schools receiving Title I School Improvement Grants [1003(g) funds] were required to align school action plan goals, strategies and activities with the district improvement plan as indicated in the AYP plan assurances.

AYP regional Coordinators delivered the following professional development services: quality indicator assessments; data analysis and data-informed school improvement planning; principal and teacher intervention dialogue and coaching frameworks for Special Education, English Language Learners, and Culturally Responsive training to help districts directly address their students' poverty-driven deficits. Districts' responsiveness to the needs of high-poverty, high-needs student populations they serve is a foundation for training. Response to Intervention training emphasized a continuum of student support and shared responsibility for student achievement. Sheltered Instruction training (SIOP) targeted research-based strategies for English Language Learners. Continuous improvement through collaboration and job-embedded learning was provided through professional learning community training and critical team features including: Identifying and defining important and recursive instructional problems; planning and implementing instructional solutions, working towards detectable improvements, specific cause-effect findings about teaching and learning, and using evidence to determine next steps about instruction. Classroom Formative Assessment practices have been highlighted in trainings as a way to forward student learning. Classroom Walkthrough Training emphasized developing effective data gathering strategies, analyzing curriculum and instruction alignment across grade levels, using reflection to increase knowledge, skills, and teacher performance, strategically aligning instruction with curriculum and increasing student learning across grade levels. The outcomes for trainings were intended to close the gap of professional development needed by districts/schools not making AYP. Institutions of higher learning are also networking with regional service cooperatives on some of these initiatives as well. All of these components fit together in support of the SSOS.

All AYP Coordinators submitted monthly work reports to the MDE indicating hours involved in on-site consultation and ongoing professional development activities for districts in Need of Improvement or Corrective Action. The reports include participation in the needs assessment process, goal setting, job-embedded professional development, data retreats, and other technical assistance specific to the request of the school/district.

Quarterly AYP Coordinator Meetings -Strategies for working with schools should be as individualized as strategies for working with students. AYP Coordinators from across all regions of the state met at least quarterly to bring their own successes and challenges about what they had seen in schools and used their collective experiences, expertise, and research on successful practices to expand their differentiated work with districts in Corrective Action and In Need of Improvement. The summer AYP Coordinator meeting was specifically targeted to AYP Coordinators strategizing about how to build the capacity of districts In Need of Improvement.

Fiscal Services Support -the MDE AYP Team supervisor and financial specialist assigned to coordinate the 1003(a) funds were in regular contact with regional service cooperative assigned staff to assure that funds were appropriately expended according to NCLB guidelines. Individual face-to-face meetings were provided with each service cooperative on the development of their 4th year

application for provision of services through the SSOS. There is also coordination and alignment with services provided through the school improvement grants [1003(g) funds].

**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).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	26
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
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)	
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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	13	1
Schools	39	7
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	08/10/09
---	----------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	45,115	45,115
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	23,771	23,771
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	52.7	52.7
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	44,980	44,980
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	26,248	26,248
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	58.4	58.4
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	24
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	13
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	176
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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
<b>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.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>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</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		197	11	20	C	
2		197	11	20	C	
3		197	11	20	C	
4		197	11	20	C	
<b>Comments:</b>						

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.

##### Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development

The emphasis in year three of the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) was to continue building district capacity within the regions of the state. Improvement plans and professional development services were differentiated to meet the unique needs of urban, suburban and rural areas. High-quality and sustained professional development was delivered by service cooperatives based on regional need assessments. The services were customized to meet the needs of eligible AYP districts and schools, especially Corrective Action and Restructuring schools. Professional development funded through NCLB programs reflected the statutory set of principles from Section 9101 (34) of NCLB.

The format of customized support included conferences, workshop/in-services, direct support to districts, schools or teams. Preplanning for contextualized support included asking the school three questions: What are the goals/outcomes you want to achieve as a result of this technical assistance? What are the participants' levels of knowledge about this support topic? What are the major areas of concern regarding this support topic? The purpose of the support was building capacity in implementing evidence-based practices.

poverty, ELL) etc. The outcomes of the professional development areas were intended to close the gap of professional development needed by districts/schools not making AYP. Institutions of higher learning were also networking with regional service cooperatives on some of these initiatives as well. All of these components fit together in support of the SSOS when coupled with leadership of MDE.

##### Utilize research-based strategies or practices

In accordance with NCLB, technical assistance and high quality professional development provided by MDE and the service cooperatives was be research-based. Simply working harder, adding on test preparation activities, or increasing the number of different teaching strategies is not adequate to prepare students to meet high standards. Research-based practices included using multiple sources of disaggregated student performance data, including state and local assessments, analysis of student work, and teacher observation to determine the learning needs for students as well as teachers.

By establishing professional learning communities, (job-embedded professional development), educators deepened content knowledge and pedagogy to continually improve practice. Teachers who spend more time collectively studying teaching practices were more effective overall at developing higher-order thinking skills and meeting the needs of diverse learners. Coordinated and aligned curriculum and assessment efforts generated through the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum have informed schools about their work.

Frequent monitoring of a manageable number of SMART improvement goals by teachers and teacher teams, administrators, and students guided the improvement focus. Using formative assessments to develop lessons supported differentiated learning and informed teachers as well as students about identified learning needs. Making decisions from evidence of student learning was the best practice approach for school improvement. Coaching provided follow-up implementation support; without it, few new strategies were implemented and sustained. Schools receiving technical assistance used a combination of these strategies to impact targeted student growth and achievement.

Black and Willam (2007); Danielson, C. (2007); Du Four, R., Eaker, R.& Many, T. (2006); Fullan, M. (2007); Hargreaves, A. (2008); Marzano, R.J. (2007); National Staff Development Council; Schmoker, M. (2006); York-Barr, J.(2004);

##### Create partnerships among the SEA, LEA, and other entities

MDE, through the regional service delivery model, provided a school or a district that is identified for improvement with extensive support and technical assistance in designing and implementing a plan to improve student achievement. MDE implemented a regional technical assistance framework to better assist the district with their improvement responsibilities. This structure allowed the School Improvement Division to develop support teams in a way that was efficient and sustainable. Furthermore, the technical assistance framework ensured a consistent system of support for schools and districts, in accordance with federal expectations. Improvement plans drove the goals, policies, procedures, professional development, and teaching and learning needs at the school.

##### Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support and district improvement teams

The regional education service delivery model ensured that schools In Need of Improvement had an active support team of skillful and experienced individuals charged with assisting their districts or schools with effective and helpful assistance to increase the opportunities for all students to meet the state's academic content and achievement standards. Teams includes some or all of the following: highly qualified or distinguished teachers and principals, pupil services personnel, parents, representatives of higher education, regional education service centers, and outside consultants.

##### Technical assistance and professional development areas that were especially beneficial for school support and district improvement

teams included data retreats, Quality Indicators (assessment tool developed for AYP schools) and onsite consultation for teams provided by regional AYP Coordinators.

AYP regional Coordinators delivered customized technical assistance and high quality professional development in many areas like tailored data retreats, classroom walkthrough trainings, quality indicator assessments, formative assessment trainings, leadership networking of teachers (in such areas as working with children with special needs, students of

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

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

##### 1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

##### Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's plan for reviewing, supporting, and monitoring School Improvement Grant awardees' goals, outcomes and activities included continuous improvement formal reporting to the state from grant awarded AYP districts and/or schools (including charters) in corrective action or pre-restructuring. The reporting meets the definition of Developmental Evaluation in that its purpose is to be educative and motivational by focusing on data-informed improved performance before and during the implementation of the grant. It creates a supportive and collaborative support system that allows for professionalism by giving feedback on the grant program to the site, the Statewide System of Support partnerships, and the State. The evaluation is carried out around the needs of the intended users. Formal reporting included monthly program progress reports which detailed the four responsibilities of the professional development coach hired with grant dollars. These responsibilities are: (a) provide high quality professional development activities aligned with student achievement reading and/or mathematics goals; (b) provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development through the establishment of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) based on best practices and research; (c) provide teachers with coaching and mentoring in reading and/or mathematics content, standards, instructional strategies and assessments; (d) incorporate formative assessment into everyday teaching practices to improve instruction and learning. Report format asked the SIG hires to include number of hours with each aforementioned responsibility as well as implementation successes and challenges. A Formative Midterm Grant Self Evaluation was completed by First Year SIG awardees and used the same responsibility criteria as the monthly progress report. Reporting invited reflection about strategies or interventions that evidence would indicate sustaining or discontinuing. Reporting what needed to begin or deepen as evidenced by student and teacher learning needs was also included in the reporting and this report was augmented with the site request for supports to further the SIG work.

Required Program Evaluation elements were contextually designed by the awardees in the original grant application. Elements included: (1) Type of data to be collected and analyzed; (2) Evidence demonstrating increased teacher effectiveness; (3) Evidence demonstrating improved student achievement; (4) A plan for monitoring and reviewing grant goals, outcomes and activities and accountability information for each funded year of the grant project. By request from awardees, the State established further guidance for End Year reporting. Here is the result of that request:

Guidelines for SIG End-of-Year Program Evaluation Report The end-of-year SIG program evaluation report should answer the following questions. The information provided below each question lists the essential elements to support answering the question. The reported data will incorporate both quantitative and qualitative data. It may include ongoing data collected through out the year as part of your formative program evaluation process to monitor and adjust your SIG work as well as any summative program evaluation data collected at the end of the year. The purpose of this work is to encourage reflection about what is working and what can be improved for the coming year. I.

What evidence indicates improved teacher effectiveness at your site as result of: a. high quality professional development activities? i. Briefly list the high quality professional development activities conducted by the SIG coach for your school and how they support work on the SIG goals.

ii. Identify and report the data collected to show the effectiveness of these SIG high quality professional development activities.

iii. Explain how the supporting data shows the SIG high quality professional development activities had an impact on teacher practice and effectiveness in the classroom.

b. job-embedded professional development around best practices and research through PLCs?

i. Summarize how professional learning communities (PLCs) are functioning in your school through SIG.

ii. Identify and report the data collected to show the effectiveness of SIG PLCs.

iii. Explain how the supporting data shows the SIG PLC job-embedded professional development activities had an impact on teacher practice and effectiveness in the classroom.

c. coaching and mentoring in reading and/or mathematics standards, strategies, and assessments?

i. Summarize how coaching and mentoring of teachers has been defined and delivered at your school through SIG.

ii. Identify and report the data collected to show the effectiveness of SIG coaching and mentoring.

iii. Explain how the supporting data shows the SIG coaching and mentoring had an impact on teacher practice and effectiveness in the classroom.

II. What evidence indicates the impact of everyday classroom formative assessment on the improvement of instruction and learning for both the teacher and the student?

a. Briefly explain how classroom formative assessment been implemented in most classrooms in your school through SIG.  
b. Identify and report the data collected to show the changes in teacher and student behavior as a result of implementing classroom formative assessment.

c. Identify and report the data was collected to show the impact of classroom formative assessment on student achievement.

d. Explain how the supporting data shows classroom formative assessment had an impact on increasing teacher effectiveness and improving student achievement.

III. What progress has your site made towards improving student achievement in mathematics and/or reading and achieving identified SMART goals as a result of the SIG work?

a. Identify and report the data collected to show change in mathematics and/or reading student achievement.

b. Identify the component of SIG that was the most effective. Why?

c. Identify the component of SIG that was the most challenging. Why?

d. Identify changes that will be made to SIG work in the future to increase effectiveness and strengthen sustainability.

IV. How has the strengthened partnership between the regional service cooperative (or Minneapolis/St. Paul technical assistance provider) and your site supported the intended outcomes of the SIG work plan?

a. Briefly describe the partnership established between your site and the regional service cooperative related to your SIG work with attention to how the regional service cooperative tailored their work to support your site's specific needs.

b. Describe the most useful experience your site had with the regional service cooperative and explain how it increased the effectiveness of your SIG work.

c. Identify changes that will be made to strengthen the partnership between your site and the regional service cooperative in the coming year in order to increase the effectiveness of your SIG work.

Please include the attached signature page with your completed end-of-year evaluation report. Consider using the information learned to help guide work in the future.

School Improvement Grant End-of-Year Evaluation Signature Page

I have read the School Improvement Grant (SIG) End-of-Year Evaluation for

(Name of school or district)

and believe it reflects the work completed during the 2008-2009 academic year.

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of SIG Professional Development Specialist Date \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Principal/Director/Superintendent

Date \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

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.

Accountability Forums -The Minnesota Department of Education Accountability Forums are a statewide collaborative effort to improve student achievement and to ensure there is "one voice carrying one message". The strategy with the development of the Accountability Forums were to provide consistent communication about AYP, transparency in policies, procedures and implementation, and technical assistance to districts on implementing polices and managing procedures.

Instead of face-to-face meetings for Accountability Forum topics, WebEx's were provided along with any other email or phone technical support as needed. School Improvement, NCLB, IT, Special Education and School Choice divisions within the MDE collaborated with the design and content of the WebEx's. WebEx topics included:

-Data in the MN Automated Reporting Student System Web EditingSystem -Data in TEST Web Editing System

-Eligibility and applying for a special education one percent waiver -Assessment administration procedures -Interpretation assessment, AYP, and Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives data -AYP calculation review and appeals requests

-Entering AYP Status -Writing a school and district improvement plan -Implementing a school and district improvement plan  
-Leveraging information in Educator Portal -SES -Corrective Action Schools -Restructuring Schools

Stage Zero (On-Watch) workshops -these were for schools and districts receiving Title I funds and had one year of Not Making AYP. MDE provided workshops at the MAASFEP spring and fall conferences (282 schools and districts were Stage Zero for 2008-09). The workshops focused on data validity, data analysis tools, stages of AYP, requirements of schools and districts in various stages of AYP, Title I budget/setaside requirements, improvement plan requirements and professional development opportunities.

For example, School Choice requirements (for stage 1 AYP schools) were discussed which included parent notification letters 14 days prior to school; 20 percent setaside for School Choice transportation options; the 10 percent building setaside for professional development; and developing a school improvement plan. Schools were encouraged to work with their Title I LEA director on planning building budgets for next year; think about support team requirements; and begin work on data analysis which emphasized the academic achievement of identified student groups.

District In Need of Improvement requirements (for stage 1 AYP districts) were discussed which included notifying parents 14 days prior to beginning of school; 10 percent district setaside for professional development; developing a district improvement plan; flexing limited to 30 percent; and district not being able to serve as an SES provider. Districts were encouraged to work with their Title I LEA director on planning building budgets for next year; think about district level composition of teams; begin work on data analysis which emphasized the academic achievement of identified student groups; and what capacity issues need strengthening to serve their schools, especially those In Need of Improvement.

There are initiatives through the School Improvement Division which also provide support for schools and districts In Need of Improvement. The mission of the School Improvement Division is to assist educators to improve student achievement by providing professional development and program support. The division supports continuous improvement efforts through professional development, Math and Science Teacher Partnerships (MSTP), Q Comp, technology in the schools (Title II D), and the statewide system of support for schools and districts not meeting AYP. The School Improvement staff provides customized, standards-based and data-driven professional development that is linked to increasing student learning through effective teaching practices.

An example of a professional development initiative was the Minnesota Department of Education (through School Improvement division) establishing nine Math and Science Teacher Academies (now called partnerships) to give extra ongoing training to teachers, with the expectation that those who participated would become trainers in their regions. The focus was helping teachers implement state subject standards, use different instruction techniques and improve their ability to assess student learning needs. Approximately 900 teachers received the training. The nine regional centers are in Fergus Falls, Mankato, Marshall, Mountain Iron, Plymouth, Rochester, St. Cloud, Staples and Thief River Falls.

Quality Compensation for Teachers (Q Comp) was proposed by Governor Tim Pawlenty and was enacted by the Minnesota Legislature in July 2005. It is a voluntary program that allows local districts and exclusive representatives of the teachers to design and collectively bargain a plan that meets the five components of the law. The five components under Q Comp include: Career Ladder/Advancement Options, Job-embedded Professional Development, Teacher Evaluation, Performance Pay, and an Alternative Salary Schedule.

Minnesota believes that effective teachers, with strong instructional practices can improve student achievement. The Q Comp program

is a professional development model that promotes the restructuring of school systems by utilizing teacher leaders and providing teachers with time to meet in collegial teams to discuss instructional practices, student achievement data, and student work. The collaborative work of the teachers is to set goals for school-wide and individual student achievement, to improve instructional practices, and work with teacher instructional leaders to improve student achievement. The program includes a peer evaluation process for every teacher that is based on skills, responsibilities and student academic improvement. Teachers are rewarded and paid based on their performance, not just seniority.

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	82,727
Applied to transfer	242
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	230

##### 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	\$ 654,098

##### 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	102

## 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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	16,463
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,638
Received supplemental educational services	2,593
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	\$ 3,880,380
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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	87,277	85,054	97.5	2,223	2.6
All elementary classes	31,340	30,743	98.1	597	1.9
All secondary classes	55,937	54,311	97.1	1,626	2.9

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because of the way data are collected, Minnesota uses a hybrid method. Since we have no classroom level student data, we must use teacher data and the teacher data are collected in the form of assignments, which can cover more than one class, but not more than one subject. For example, a teacher may teach two classes of Algebra I and have one assignment for Algebra I. Alternately, the same teacher could instead be reported with a separate assignment for each "section" of Algebra I taught.

## 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
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	67.2
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	29.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	3.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	76.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	19.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	4.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	8,979	8,667	96.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	8,596	8,438	98.2
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	9,070	8,277	91.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	22,140	21,802	98.5

**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	53.0	22.8
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price lunch data. low poverty school 22.84%	
Secondary schools	58.3	22.8
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price lunch data. low poverty school 22.81%	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.6.2 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	68,287
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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.	64,490
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	27,140
Hmong	16,591
Somali	8,867
Vietnamese	1,931
Russian	1,231

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	57,106
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,827
Total	62,933
<b>Comments: The business rules used for LEP changed this year to be consistent that only LEP students who have taken all three tests are counted in the proficiency calculations.</b>	

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	4,654
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	8.1
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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	54,465
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,509
Total	59,974
<b>Comments: The business rules used for LEP changed this year to be consistent that only LEP students who have taken all three tests are counted in the proficiency calculations.</b>	
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.	29,697

#### 1.6.3.2.2

##### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
- 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.**
- 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.**
- 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	40,004	67.6	10,955	68.00
ELP attainment	4,454	7.5	28,287	4.50
<b>Comments:</b>				

### 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
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
none
<b>Comments:</b>

#### 1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
none
<b>Comments:</b>

#### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
none
<b>Comments:</b>

### 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
7,225	6,023	13,248
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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
6,982	3,878	55.5	3,104
<b>Comments:</b>			

#### 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
7,217	4,705	65.2	2,512

Comments:

#### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

##### Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,207	844	26.3	2,363
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	96
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	7
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	61
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	24
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	31
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	31
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	56
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	11
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

#### 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?	Yes
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	3
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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
		5

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.

Please see numbers below as no working text entry box exists for them above. # Immigrant Students Enrolled = 15683 # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = 2346

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

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,226
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	332

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:

- Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
- #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.)**
- Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
- Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	149	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	107	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	92	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	94	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	94	
Other (Explain in comment box)	27	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	144	9,258
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	129	1,822
PD provided to principals	115	642
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	103	405
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	89	1,356
PD provided to community based organization personnel	38	582
Total	164	14,065

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
07/02/09	10/30/09	90
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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.

MDE is in the process of streamlining all grant applications and approval procedures.

### 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	
<b>Comments: 0 (zero)</b>	

## 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	91.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	76.6
Hispanic	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	94.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	85.1
Limited English proficient	62.6
Economically disadvantaged	82.9
Migratory students	
Male	90.5
Female	92.8
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	1.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3.9
Hispanic	3.6
White, non-Hispanic	0.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.2
Limited English proficient	3.5
Economically disadvantaged	2.4
Migratory students	2.6
Male	1.6
Female	1.3
<b>Comments: The drop-out data above is different from previous data because it looks at the fall enrollments of the subsequent year to see if the student 'was enrolled at the beginning of the current school year'.</b>	

### 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	503	503
LEAs with subgrants	7	7
Total	510	510
<b>Comments: includes 4 spec ed coops/reg centers</b>		

### 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)	48	123
K	211	583
1	233	413
2	213	434
3	223	398
4	196	363
5	192	381
6	147	325
7	159	341
8	150	341
9	204	360
10	183	335
11	176	333
12	223	302
Ungraded		
Total	2,558	5,032
<b>Comments: COMMENT: In Moorhead 700 students were displaced by flooding of the Red River which was a flood stage for 40 days and crested twice during that time. Of these 150 remained homeless (doubled up) for the remainder of the school year.</b>		

### 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	972	3,493
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,308	1,266
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	33	93
Hotels/Motels	245	180
Total	2,558	5,032
<b>Comments: 0</b>		

### 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

#### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,089
K	611
1	468
2	560
3	492
4	439
5	515
6	387
7	387
8	388
9	456
10	432
11	412
12	695
Ungraded	
Total	7,331
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	324
Migratory children/youth	12
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,377
Limited English proficient students	546
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	7
Expedited evaluations	7
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	7
Coordination between schools and agencies	6
Counseling	5
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
School supplies	7
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	7

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	6
Transportation	5
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	270	115
4	270	74
5	258	82
6	212	56
7	211	53
8	207	63
High School	177	57
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	273	106
4	275	66
5	254	64
6	211	41
7	212	45
8	206	35
High School	141	13
<b>Comments:</b>		

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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	568
K	180
1	188
2	191
3	188
4	158
5	169
6	167
7	159
8	149
9	122
10	149
11	119
12	70
Ungraded	37
Out-of-school	10
Total	2,624
<b>Comments: need data</b>	

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

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease is due to lack of work this summer in some areas of the state due to changes in agricultural work (Round Up Ready Sugarbeet, less need for hand labor), bad weather kept some families away due to lack of work and due to country's economic hardships, some families did not move due to lack of funds.

### 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	373
K	77
1	69
2	65
3	71
4	45
5	61
6	60
7	49
8	45
9	22
10	17
11	29
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	992
<b>Comments: 0</b>	

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 decrease is due to lack of work this summer in some areas of the state due to changes in agricultural work (Round Up Ready Sugarbeet, less need for hand labor), bad weather kept some families away due to lack of work and due to country's economic hardships, some families did not move due to lack of funds.

### 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.

What system did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and 2 child count? Minnesota began using the MIS2000 system in January 2000.

Were the child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system? Yes, Minnesota used the MIS2000 system last year.

#### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

Minnesota Identification & Recruitment process worked cooperatively with Tri-Valley Opportunity Council (TVOC) to recruit potential eligible migrant children ages 6 weeks to age 21 with oversight by Midwest Migrant Educational Resource Center (MMERC). This joint recruitment process allowed TVOC, a Head Start program serving children ages 6 weeks to 5 years old or until they enter Kindergarten and the Title I Migrant Education Program to directly serve students PreK-21.

What data were collected?

The following COE data elements were collected: student information (family surnames): birth date, age, gender, race; parent or guardian

(s) legal names, current residence, home base residence, all children's names, relationship to parent or guardian, current grade and school, qualifying activity, qualifying activity date and residence date.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

The local and regional outreach workers conducted personal interviews in the following locations: homes, schools, businesses, labor camp, processing plants, in the fields and farms with potential eligible migrant families to determine eligibility using an original, triplicate paper copy of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Once eligibility was determined the parent/guardian and the recruiter both signed the COE for eligibility verification.

School Year Process-the local Recruiter/school liaison gathered information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. We also had several regional recruiters that identified migrant students in unfunded districts and did outreach to agricultural businesses. The information was reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to the ID & R Manager at TVOC and forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputted the data into MIS2000 system. TVOC runs reports to cross check the data that has been entered. The Quality Control specialist reviews the reports on the MIS2000 system for accuracy.

Summer Process-the regional Statewide Recruiter (Family Service Worker (FSW)/Local Recruiters) gathered information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. The information was reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to the ID & R Manager at TVOC and then forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputted the data into MIS2000 system. TVOC runs reports to cross check the data that has been entered and forwards it the Quality Control specialist to review reports on the MIS2000 system for accuracy.

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

The data was collected continuously and submitted regularly and entered into the MIS2000 database.

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.

In order to verify the count and before any of the tables are run, our MIS2000 data entry clerk ran a snap report of the MIS2000 database system called "Potential Duplicate Students". A list was generated that identified all students that had the same first and last name and same date of birth. The students were merged in the system to eliminate any duplication. A second report was run from the Potential Duplicate Student, but using different criteria. A request was made for the same first name OR last name AND same date of birth. This list is much longer. That was a check for any possible misspellings or obvious errors. We verified the COE to see if the students had the same family surname. Sometimes it was discovered that there were two COEs for the same family. Reports of enrolled children are sent to district data clerks periodically throughout the year to cross check for accuracy of information in the State MARSS database and to ensure that only eligible children have been entered into the migrant database (MIS2000). Current enrolled reports are run periodically and the Quality Control specialist compares those numbers to district and recruiters reports to ensure all data has been entered accurately and to monitor counts.

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.

### 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.

- 1 students who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were between 3-21 years of age, were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- 2 students who were residents in Minnesota for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/01-8/31);
- 3 students who in the case of category 2-received MEP funded services during the summer or intersession term; and
- 4 students once per child count category.

EnrollDate, FundingDate, QADate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate was between the StartDate and the EndDate entered (check for dates of activity that occur during the date range.)

FacilityID was between MN and MO (count only enrollments in MN schools

Birthdate was after the StartDate minus 22 years (The child turns 22 after StartDate.)

Birthdate was before the EndDate minus 3 years (The child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)

22nd Birthday was after the FundingDate (the child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)

3rd Birthday was before the WithdrawDate, or the WithdrawDate is null (The child turns 3 before the WithdrawDate or there is no Withdrawdate entered.)

LQMDate plus 3 years was after the StartDate (LQMDate is within 3 years of the StartDate.)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 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.

All recruiters were required to attend trainings throughout the year that discuss eligibility requirements, accurate completion of the Certificate of Eligibility, receive updates on new regulations or systems like MSIX, train on interviewing skills, hands on exercises with scenarios, agri-businesses connections, and communicate and share ideas with peers. Each training has a pre and post test component to ensure that recruiters have understood the concepts. Minnesota has also instituted a certification process which requires recruiters to successfully pass a test. Those who do not pass receive individual assistance from their regional recruiter until they do pass.

Does MN provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)? Yes, recruiters receive the MN Identification and Recruitment manual, plus all recruiters receive a copy of OME Non-Regulatory Guidance. Weekly conference calls are held throughout the year to update regional recruiters. In the summer, all recruiters have a regional conference call to discuss eligibility information and to share pertinent recruiting information with others. The recruiter conducts a personal interview to gather migrant eligibility information on the COE, once eligibility was determined and COE was completed then both the parents and the recruiter verified the data by signing the original COE. Each COE is then reviewed by the TVOC ID&R manager to ensure that eligibility requirements are met and that it is filled out accurately. If the manager discovers that a family is not eligible, the specific recruiter, ID&R oversight coordinator and state department are notified. The ineligible students are taken out of MIS2000 and kept in a separate file.

Does MN periodically evaluate the effectiveness of recruitments efforts and revise procedures? Yes, recruitment procedures have been evaluated and adjusted to increase the effectiveness of recruitment efforts. This past year defining the recruitment regions, working with school district staff at funded districts and working closely with MARRS coordinators and state MARRS coordinator have increased the effectiveness of recruitment efforts in Minnesota.

Once the COE is filled out by local staff, the project coordinator or site supervisor reviews the COE for accuracy and completeness. The COE is then sent to TVOC IDR Manager, who reviews the COE for completeness and accuracy. If there are any errors or missing information for eligibility determination, TVOC IDR Manager contacts the Migrant Program for clarification and the file is marked pending until information is clarified. If COE is accurate and complete, TVOC IDR Manager signs the COE verifying student eligibility and COE is entered into state Migrant data base.

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.

68 students were randomly selected for re-interview process. Some of the families were contacted via phone or home visit. In cases where a second interview was not attainable (no phone available); other supporting documents were sought. MSIX (see if child was enrolled in another state), MN school district enrollment records and Migrant Head Start supporting documents were viewed to further determine eligibility. Of the 68 students in the study 0 were found ineligible.

Was your re-interviewing sample done statewide overall or was it stratified by group/area? The re-interviewing sample was done statewide.

Were re-interviewers trained and provided guidance? Yes, re-interviewing was done by TVOC IDR Manager and Regional Recruiters.

Were re-interviewers independent from original interviewers? Yes.

The TVOC IDR Manager, randomly pulls two COE's per Recruiter to re-interview.

Families who were served in the Migrant Head Start program and have paper work that establishes move of residency and work in qualifying agricultural activity will be counted as eligible. Families that were not served in the Migrant Head Start program will be contacted by a Regional Recruiter or the TVOC IDR Manager either by phone or home visit. Each person who has recruited, regional Recruiter/Family Service Worker/Migrant Liaison, will have at least one family contacted in a 2 year cycle.

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.

Minnesota Migrant Education Program weekly ran the "Verify COE data" in the MIS2000 system, which the data entry clerk used to

crosscheck the report to ensure that all the required data elements were entered accurately into the system. The data entry clerk sent the batch of COEs to the State Migrant Education Program for filing.

Reports of enrolled children are sent to district data clerks periodically throughout the year to cross check for accuracy of information in the State MARSS database and to ensure that only eligible children have been entered into the migrant database (MIS2000). Current enrolled reports are run periodically and the Quality Control specialist compares those numbers to district and recruiters reports to ensure all data has been entered accurately and to monitor counts.

Data entry performs periodic audit reports for accuracy. Districts receive a report of students enrolled in the state database, they in turn check report for accuracy and report any discrepancies. IDR Oversight coordinator and IDR Manager also run reports quarterly to check for accuracy. Count by program reports are run four times a year and shared with staff to review and check for accuracy.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The final steps taken by the SEA was to upload changes, verify and back up data to ensure that the most accurate data was reported to the Office of Migrant Education. The above mentioned checks were programmed in the MIS2000 system to report only requested reporting elements.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA will be utilizing the Student Linking System to verify that LEAs are only reporting eligible migrant students. This will allow the MEP to ensure correct data entry.

Each COE is reviewed by the TVOC IDR manager to ensure that eligibility requirements are met and that it is filled out accurately. If the TVOC IDR manager discovers that a family is not eligible, the specific recruiter, ID&R oversight coordinator and state department are notified. The ineligible students are taken out of MIS2000 and kept in a separate file.

If any students are found ineligible during our annual state re-interviewing process, these students will be removed from MIS2000. Results of the re-interview are shared with oversight coordinator, the state department and local districts and recruiters. Districts/recruiters having an ineligible student will be contacted to determine the best way to correct the discrepancy.

Increased training has occurred for all staff filling out COE's, especially the need for additional comments for certain conditions such as to join, early move and especially for any type of temporary work. We have also stressed that recruiters only use types of work listed on handout from state or if work isn't listed only with permission from TVOC IDR Manager.

We have also strengthened our recruiter assessments and are currently in the process of developing certification process for staff filling out the COE.

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.