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

NEW JERSEY

NoChild
LeftBehind

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:

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

  _X_ Part I, 2008-09   ___Part II, 2008-09

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

Address:
100 River View Plaza
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Clare Barrett

Telephone: (609) 292-5408

Fax: (609) 633-6874

e-mail: clare.barrett@doe.state.nj.us

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

_____   _Thursday, March 11, 2010, 5:40:03 PM_

   Signature   Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09

NoChild
LeftBehind

**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.

New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards were adopted in Summer 2009 in seven of the nine core content areas: visual and performing arts, comprehensive health and physical education; science; social studies; world languages; technology and 21st century life and careers.

Revisions to the NJ standards for language arts and mathematics are temporarily on hold pending the release of the Common Core Standards Project, a multistate-led initiative (involving 48 states) coordinated by Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governor's Association (NGA), to develop common English-language arts and mathematics standards in the states.

Anticipated release of Common Core Standards in January 2010 will require State Board Adoption-Comment period (Winter 2010), Anticipated Adoption (Spring/Summer 2010)

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state's assessments and academic achievement standards in mathematics and reading/language arts are currently undergoing the ED's peer review process and have not yet been approved.

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 <u>not</u> 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's assessments and academic achievement standards in science are currently undergoing the ED's peer review process and have not yet been approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance withESEA. 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 Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	724,423		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	783		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	61,931		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	121,983		>97%
Hispanic	138,428		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	397,319		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	119,837		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,690		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	217,285		>97%
Migratory students	124		>97%
Male	372,112		>97%
Female	351,870		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	16,784	14.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	93,944	79.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,746	6.5
Total	118,474	
Comments: Updated: New Jersey does not have alternate assessment based on grade levels or modified achievement standards.		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	724,450		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	783		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	61,935		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	121,981		>97%
Hispanic	138,437		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	397,336		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	119,847		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,694		92.3
Economically disadvantaged students	217,293		>97%
Migratory students	124		>97%
Male	372,132		>97%
Female	351,878		>97%
Comments: LEP EXEMPT student should not be included in the denominator			

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 <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> 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	16,809	14.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	94,078	79.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,752	6.5
Total	118,639	
Comments: Updated: New Jersey does not have alternate assessment based on grade levels or modified achievement standards.		

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	209,792		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	206		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,666		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	35,945		>97%
Hispanic	40,687		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	114,209		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,323		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,152		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	65,032		>97%
Migratory students	35		>97%
Male	107,806		>97%
Female	101,851		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	27,826	79.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,873	14.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,182	6.3
Total	34,881	
Comments: Updated: New Jersey does not have alternate assessment based on grade levels or modified achievement standards.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school.The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	102,855	77,183	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	116	77	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,433	8,492	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17,383	9,355	53.8
Hispanic	21,433	13,671	63.8
White, non-Hispanic	53,848	45,182	83.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,412	9,446	57.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,394	2,130	48.5
Economically disadvantaged students	34,381	20,230	58.8
Migratory students	17	N<12	
Male	52,899	39,645	74.9
Female	49,882	37,507	75.2
Comments: As part of its emphasis on raising academic standards, in Spring 2009 NJDOE administered a new Assessment for Grade 3 and 4. The results are not comparable to previous years. Please refer to the NJ Accountability Workbook for Assessment schedule. The change in enrollment numbers for Native American and Migratory population is a result of small n-size.			

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

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	102,593	64,392	62.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	116	65	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,275	7,297	78.7
Black, non-Hispanic	17,345	7,261	41.9
Hispanic	21,433	10,116	47.2
White, non-Hispanic	53,786	39,293	73.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,429	6,114	37.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,118	1,162	28.2
Economically disadvantaged students	34,273	14,613	42.6
Migratory students	17	N<12	
Male	52,772	30,539	57.9
Female	49,747	33,831	68.0
Comments: As part of its emphasis on raising academic standards, in Spring 2009 NJDOE administered a new Assessment for Grade 3 and 4. The results are not comparable to previous years. Please refer to the NJ Accountability Workbook for Assessment schedule. The change in enrollment numbers for Native American and Migratory population is a result of small n-size.			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,446	75,283	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	87	55	63.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,020	7,986	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	17,787	8,984	50.5
Hispanic	20,723	12,728	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	55,335	45,242	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,299	9,084	52.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,387	1,519	44.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,828	19,077	56.4
Migratory students	19	N<12	
Male	53,026	38,643	72.9
Female	50,371	36,626	72.7
Comments: As part of its emphasis on raising academic standards, in Spring 2009 NJDOE administered a new Assessment for Grade 3 and 4. The results are not comparable to previous years. Please refer to the NJ Accountability Workbook for Assessment schedule.			

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,117	64,947	63.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	87	47	54.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,870	7,133	80.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,720	7,080	40.0
Hispanic	20,693	9,467	45.8
White, non-Hispanic	55,260	40,959	74.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,261	5,971	34.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,113	753	24.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33,688	13,919	41.3
Migratory students	19	N<12	
Male	52,853	31,923	60.4
Female	50,216	33,004	65.7
Comments: As part of its emphasis on raising academic standards, in Spring 2009 NJDOE administered a new Assessment for Grade 3 and 4. The results are not comparable to previous years. Please refer to the NJ Accountability Workbook for Assessment schedule. The change in enrollment numbers for Native American and Migratory population is a result of small n-size.			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,311	93,533	90.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	86	77	89.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,011	8,590	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	17,741	14,020	79.0
Hispanic	20,694	17,358	83.9
White, non-Hispanic	55,287	53,071	96.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,278	13,502	78.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,377	2,218	65.7
Economically disadvantaged students	33,758	27,405	81.2
Migratory students	19	14	73.7
Male	52,944	47,693	90.1
Female	50,318	45,804	91.0
Comments: Migratory small cell size. LEP results are verified and accurate.			

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,463	79,842	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	95	66	69.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,138	8,399	91.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17,449	9,759	55.9
Hispanic	20,118	13,325	66.2
White, non-Hispanic	56,066	47,891	85.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,338	8,995	51.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,715	1,217	44.8
Economically disadvantaged students	32,933	20,301	61.6
Migratory students	12	N<12	
Male	53,375	41,096	77.0
Female	50,016	38,710	77.4
Comments: Migratory small cell size.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,162	67,835	65.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	92	45	48.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,974	7,480	83.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,410	7,382	42.4
Hispanic	20,093	9,600	47.8
White, non-Hispanic	56,001	42,993	76.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,331	5,516	31.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,449	464	19.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32,832	14,273	43.5
Migratory students	12	N<12	
Male	53,240	32,597	61.2
Female	49,849	35,209	70.6
Comments: Migratory small cell size.			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,713	73,386	70.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	106	66	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,874	7,939	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	17,520	8,088	46.2
Hispanic	20,045	11,389	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	56,582	45,561	80.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,005	6,365	37.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,447	796	32.5
Economically disadvantaged students	32,070	16,546	51.6
Migratory students	27	15	55.6
Male	53,345	37,686	70.6
Female	50,303	35,675	70.9
Comments: Migratory small cell size.			

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,518	72,139	69.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	107	68	63.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,766	7,571	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,512	8,199	46.8
Hispanic	20,017	10,621	53.1
White, non-Hispanic	56,537	45,347	80.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,014	5,602	32.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,237	468	20.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31,987	15,404	48.2
Migratory students	27	12	44.4
Male	53,233	35,176	66.1
Female	50,222	36,940	73.6
Comments: Districts adjusted intruction to accommodate second year of revised tests.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104,261	69,069	66.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	103	62	60.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,782	7,693	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,443	7,081	40.6
Hispanic	19,752	9,970	50.5
White, non-Hispanic	57,580	43,944	76.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,306	5,254	30.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,614	769	29.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31,061	14,255	45.9
Migratory students	15	N<12	
Male	53,479	35,335	66.1
Female	50,721	33,712	66.5
Comments: Migratory small cell size			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,995	74,673	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	98	68	69.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,665	7,691	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	17,404	8,602	49.4
Hispanic	19,719	11,071	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	57,515	46,892	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,294	5,863	33.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,358	638	27.1
Economically disadvantaged students	30,949	15,854	51.2
Migratory students	15	N<12	
Male	53,340	36,216	67.9
Female	50,594	38,433	76.0
Comments: Migratory small cell size			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	105,538	75,048	71.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	118	74	62.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,619	7,725	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,854	7,960	44.6
Hispanic	19,787	11,200	56.6
White, non-Hispanic	58,591	47,781	81.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,652	5,672	32.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,728	851	31.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30,805	15,615	50.7
Migratory students	15	N<12	
Male	54,282	38,433	70.8
Female	51,180	36,589	71.5
Comments: Migratory Small cell size			

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

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	105,514	86,156	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	116	96	82.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,493	7,868	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,915	11,036	61.6
Hispanic	19,813	13,615	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	58,613	53,157	90.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,730	8,468	47.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,534	811	32.0
Economically disadvantaged students	30,821	19,727	64.0
Migratory students	15	N<12	
Male	54,309	42,075	77.5
Female	51,126	44,044	86.2
Comments: Migratory Small cell size			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	105,328	88,349	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	100	85.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,610	8,032	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	17,798	11,474	64.5
Hispanic	19,738	14,237	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	58,505	54,111	92.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,603	10,229	58.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,716	1,175	43.3
Economically disadvantaged students	30,692	20,839	67.9
Migratory students	15	12	80.0
Male	54,181	45,255	83.5
Female	51,075	43,053	84.3
Comments: Migrantory small cell size. LEP results are verfied and accurate.			

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	98,158	71,174	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	152	110	72.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,973	7,142	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	15,461	6,611	42.8
Hispanic	15,898	8,965	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	58,268	48,131	82.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,462	4,775	30.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,284	605	26.5
Economically disadvantaged students	20,825	10,578	50.8
Migratory students	16	N<12	
Male	49,900	36,281	72.7
Female	48,238	34,886	72.3
Comments: Migratory small cell size.			

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	98,422	82,007	83.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	153	129	84.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,980	7,246	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	15,539	9,814	63.2
Hispanic	15,958	11,495	72.0
White, non-Hispanic	58,376	53,062	90.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,580	7,408	47.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,287	563	24.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20,912	13,921	66.6
Migratory students	16	N<12	
Male	50,059	40,275	80.5
Female	48,343	41,719	86.3
Comments: Migratory small cell size.			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	2,317	1,503	64.9
Districts	631	527	83.5
Comments:			

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	1,370	818	59.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	378	133	35.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	992	685	69.0
Comments:			

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
502	406	80.9
Comments:		

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 û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	12
Extension of the school year or school day	16
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	5
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	36
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action [2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Fifteen districts in corrective action were designated for intensive assistance in 2008-2009. Five major initiatives, designed to improve district capacity, were conducted for these districts including:

1	Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) teams
2	Collaborative benchmark meetings
3	Systems thinking for development of the DINI Plan
4	District Support Services Project
5	Scientifically Research-based workshop series—data analysis, conducting walkthroughs, four seminars using IES practices guides

1. Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) teams of highly skilled professionals worked with the Title I schools in the fifteen districts in need of improvement. Each of the fifteen districts had one or more schools that received a three or four-day CAPA visit. During a CAPA visit, district and school staff members serve as partners on the team in an effort to build local capacity to oversee their low-performing schools. The CAPA review is designed to assist schools and districts in identifying programs and systems that are effective in advancing student achievement. CAPA identifies programs and systems that need to be improved or eliminated in order to ensure delivery of a thorough and efficient education for all of New Jersey's students. The external team consists of a leader, principal, parent and content specialists for language arts, mathematics, special education and English Language Learners. District and school representatives also represent these areas to form sub teams with the external team members.

CAPA identifies areas of strength and improvement for schools using the indicators of effective school practice from a document entitled the Teaching and Learning Tool. The standard areas include:

Curriculum
Assessment and Evaluation
Instruction
School Culture
Student, Family and Community Support
Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation
Leadership

2. The benchmark follow-up process consists of at least two full-day visits each year for all schools having received a CAPA visit. There were 111 schools from the fifteen districts that received assistance from a highly skilled educator. The purpose of the two one-day follow up meetings is to build district capacity by:

Providing a professional learning experience by facilitating an ongoing needs assessment, data analysis, action planning and focused walkthrough process;
Reviewing the NCLB Unified Plan to determine the level of implementation of action plans or prioritized recommendations in the Benchmark Summary Form;
Determining the level of implementation and effectiveness of strategies in the NCLB Unified Plan, school restructuring plan, and School Improvement Allocations (SIA) Parts A and G;
Determining what further assistance may be needed.

3. A district leadership team participated in three workshops entitled "Systems Thinking—Implementing the 2010 DINI Action Plan" presented by Mr. F. Mike Miles. Mike Miles is one of the leading experts on systems thinking in education. He is currently the superintendent at Harrison School District Two in Colorado Springs. The workshops were followed by a peer review of the district's DINI plan. After receiving the peer review, two additional follow up workshops were held to discuss implementation and evaluation. The purpose of the systems thinking initiative is to:
Learn about systems thinking in action: definitions, common language, applications for leadership, emphasize that systems thinking is NOT an "add on"—rather a method of organizing, integrating and synthesizing all they do
Develop one NCLB Unified Plan (school improvement plan) for the school using systems thinking—the plan would contain the components for local, state, federal requirements
Tie together -vision, mission, goals, needs assessment, unified plan and the role and involvement of stakeholders (SLC)
Align the schools' Unified Plans with the district DINI plan
Provide resources to assist in applying systems thinking

4. The District Support Services program started in August 2009 as a collaborative effort between the Division of Student Services and the Division of District and School Improvement. Fifteen DOE staff members were assigned to each district in need of improvement. The DINI facilitator meets with the district leadership team on a monthly basis to provide support and technical assistance regarding program and fiscal reporting. The purpose of the project is to:• Develop a climate of trust and open dialogue with both district and school

administrators which will foster a collegial relationship through which to assist in the implementation of problem-solving strategies.

      Provide a district specialist who will function as a broker of services, motivator, facilitator, critical friend and reviewer of school progress.

      Provide support and technical assistance with respect to implementation of the district's DINI plan.

5. The scientifically research-based workshop series is a joint partnership with two federal assistance centers located at George Washington University (Mid Atlantic Comprehensive Center) and Rutgers University (Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic). The purpose of the series is to give all districts and schools in need of improvement the opportunity to learn about high-quality research on topics important to practitioners and policymakers in understanding and applying scientifically based research. The following workshops were filled to capacity (between 75 and 100 educators at each) held in 2008-2009:

      Turning Around Chronically Low Performing Schools: Bridging the Gap between Research and Practice with Dr Rebecca Herman, managing research analyst at the American Institute for Research and Dr. Marlene Darwin, senior research analyst at the American Institute for Research

      Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning with Dr. Hal Pashler, University of California, San Diego

      Improving Adolescent Literacy with Dr. Michael Kamil, Professor of Education at Stanford University

      An Introduction To Learning Walks & Reflective Inquiry with Dr. Lois Easton of the National Staff Development Council

      Using Data to Inform Instruction with Dr. Tracey Severns, Principal, Mt. Olive Middle School

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	3
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	5
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	2
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	12/09/09

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	175,216	155,651
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	97,810	93,487
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	55.8	60.1
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	174,989	155,573
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	97,288	93,525
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	55.6	60.1
Comments: NJ has submiitted the N132 and the N075 Edfacts files. Data is not populating the fields.		

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 <u>not</u> 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	107
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	21
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	301
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	**Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.**	**Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status**	**Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)**	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.**
	Curriculum Alignment Effective Walkthroughs Classroom Management Improved Grade Level Meetings Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessments Differentiated Instruction Increased Use of Technology SIOP					Improved job embedded professional development in Special Education, Math and Language Arts through coaches Decrease in special education classification Implementation of Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessment

1	Implementation Use of Learning Centers Use of Data to Improve Instruction Common Planning Time Student Learning Profiles Establishing College Pathways Improved Instruction	73	2	14	C	Decrease in discipline referrals and suspensions Increase in staff attendance Increased opportunities for teacher collaboration Increased sharing of effective practices Better understanding of use of data Implementation of a mentoring program for students
	Curriculum Alignment Effective Walkthroughs Classroom Management Improved Grade Level Meetings Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessments					Improved job embedded professional development in Special Education, Math and Language Arts through coaches Decrease in special education classification
2	Differentiated Instruction Increased Use of Technology SIOP Implementation Use of Learning Centers Use of Data to Improve Instruction Common Planning Time Student Learning Profiles Establishing College Pathways Improved Instruction	73	3	13	C	Implementation of Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessment Decrease in discipline referrals and suspensions Increase in staff attendance Increased opportunities for teacher collaboration Increased sharing of effective practices Better understanding of use of data Implementation of a mentoring program for students

3	Curriculum Alignment Effective Walkthroughs Classroom Management Improved Grade Level Meetings Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessments Differentiated Instruction Increased Use of Technology SIOP Implementation Use of Learning Centers Use of Data to Improve Instruction Common Planning Time Student Learning Profiles Establishing College Pathways Improved Instruction	32	1	4	C	Improved job embedded professional development in Special Education, Math and Language Arts through coaches Decrease in special education classification Implementation of Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessment Decrease in discipline referrals and suspensions Increase in staff attendance Increased opportunities for teacher collaboration Increased sharing of effective practices Better understanding of use of data Implementation of a mentoring program for students
	Curriculum Alignment Effective Walkthroughs Classroom Management Improved Grade Level Meetings Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessments Differentiated Instruction Increased Use of Technology SIOP Implementation Use of Learning					Improved job embedded professional development in Special Education, Math and Language Arts through coaches Decrease in special education classification Implementation of Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessment Decrease in discipline referrals

	Centers Use of Data to Improve Instruction Common Planning Time Student Learning Profiles Establishing College Pathways Improved Instruction					and suspensions Increase in staff attendance Increased opportunities for teacher collaboration Increased sharing of effective practices Better understanding of use of data Implementation of a mentoring program for students
5		17	1	2	D	
Comments:						

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.

Effective strategies for districts and schools identified in 1.4.8.3 were shared during workshops, conferences, technical assistance sessions and while conducting Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) visits and meetings. Below is a description of some of these activities.

The CAPA process includes an initial visit to schools in corrective action and benchmark follow up meetings twice each year. If the school progresses to restructuring, a shorter return benchmark visit is conducted.

During a CAPA visit, district and school staff members serve as partners on the team in an effort to build local capacity to oversee their low-performing schools. Their participation serves as a tool for professional learning to introduce and reinforce successful research-based practices.

A CAPA consultant learning community meets monthly for the following purpose: 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 that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures. CAPA consultants are knowledgeable about NJDOE policies, procedures and initiatives as well as experts and leaders in school improvement and the CAPA process. Each learning community agenda includes one or more research-based practice.

The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center continues to assist in documenting case studies from identified schools with established effective practices in key areas in addition to making significant gains in student achievement. These schools represent an important opportunity to learn how the leadership in these schools were able to implement effective practices under challenging circumstances (pressure from being identified for improvement for several consecutive years, high poverty student populations, high mobility, etc.). The case studies have been documented with evidence that is shared with schools in advanced levels of status.

Twenty-six schools were awarded "reward grants" for meeting the federal AYP targets for two years in a row. This success is particularly notable since the schools were previously in an advanced level of school improvement status. The school's improvement efforts resulted in rising student achievement. In exchange for receiving the reward grant, the district and school agree to do the following:

Participate in effective practice case study project—includes a school visit by a team of DOE staff to gather information on at least two effective practices;

Present the effective practice at showcase workshops;

Permit observation of the effective practice by other schools

Twenty-five workshops for schools in need of improvement were conducted to assist in the development of a school improvement plan (Title I Unified Plan) to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the school, so that greater numbers of students achieve proficiency in the areas of language arts literacy and mathematics. The agenda included how to annually conduct a comprehensive needs assessment based upon most recent achievement goals and actual performance.

On January 22, 2009, 1000 educators attended an NCLB Implementation Training conference that emphasized practical application and program delivery for NCLB. Sessions were presented by panels of district personnel and other experts who shared best practices, successes, and challenges. Each session was directed by a program expert who moderated the panel. Breakouts included the following areas of interest:

Operating an Effective Title I Program,•Implementing a Parent Involvement Program

Analyzing and Using Data,•Success Strategies for LEP Students

Infusing Technology into the Classroom,•Implementing a Safe and Drug-Free School Program,•Delivering an Effective Professional Development Program

Recruiting and Retaining Highly Qualified Staff,•Budget Planning and Expenditure Tracking,•Successful Inclusion of Students with Disabilities,•Implementing the NCLB Monitoring Process,•Managing an SES Program,•Conducting a Comprehensive Needs Assessment,•Successful Strategies for Educating Highly Mobile Populations

Successful Parent Involvement with the PIRC,•Calculating AYP ? An Interactive Session

More than 1000 educators attended five regional workshops on Understanding Accountability. Topics included:

What Is AYP?,•Elements of AYP: N size, student subgroups, indicators (primary--participation, performance; secondary),*Calculation Process,•High School Banking

Confidence Interval,•Preliminary vs. Final Results,•Safe Harbor,•AYP Calculator,•Using the On-line Calculator Tool,•Analyzing Results: What Does the Data Tell Us? ,•A Look at the One-Year and Three-Year Trend Charts

In June, 2009 the School Support Services project was established as a collaborative effort between the Division of Student Services (DSS) and the Division of District and School Improvement (DSI). Twenty-nine of the lowest performing schools were selected for participation in the School Support Services project. A SINI facilitator is assigned to each school and meets at least two times each month. The purpose of the project is to:

Develop a climate of trust and open dialogue with both district and school administrators which will foster a collegial relationship through which to assist in the implementation of problem-solving strategies.

Provide a school specialist who will function as a broker of services, motivator, facilitator, critical friend and reviewer of school progress.

Provide support and technical assistance with respect to implementation of the school's NCLB Unified Plan, Restructuring Plan and activities funded through School Improvement Part a and g. These twenty-nine schools were selected using two factors: any school in year 8 and any school that is in year 4 and a "C" in the NJDOE differentiated accountability model. The accountability model sorts schools into three letter categories (A, B, and C). To develop this method of differentiation, several trends in our current accountability system were analyzed. The first step was to develop differentiation factors based on the concepts of Total Population Pervasiveness and Subgroup Pervasiveness. Among schools identified as in need of improvement (N=354), data were analyzed for every tested grade span:

Elementary (grades 3-5), Middle (grades 6-8), High School (grade 11) and content area (Math, LAL). Factor I -Total Population Pervasiveness is the degree to which the school is below the state average for proficiency in each subject area and in each tested grade span.

Schools were ranked according to their difference from the state average for grade spans and content area.

After the schools were ranked, we chose to create a lower quartile. As the 25th percentile was determined to be 32% points below the state mean, this point was used as the minimum criteria for meeting this factor

Schools that are no more than 32 percentage points below the state average are considered to have met the criteria. This was determined in each tested grade span and content area in a school.

•Conversely, schools that are more than 32 percentage points below the state average will be considered to have missed the criteria. This

was determined in each tested grade span and content area in a school.

Factor II -Subgroup Pervasiveness is the percentage of accountable AYP indicators the school has achieved. All subgroups that meet the minimum N size are included.

Schools were ranked by the percent of indicators met in the school in each tested grade span and content area. •After the schools were ranked, we chose to create a lower quartile. As the 25th percentile was determined to have met 75% of the criteria, this point was used as the minimum criteria for meeting this factor.

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.

Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) teams work with Title I schools and districts in need of improvement. The activities below outline the evaluation and technical assistance provided.

Ongoing technical assistance is provided to schools and districts receiving Part (g) funds to aid them in the conducting of data analysis, needs assessment and creation of the unified school improvement plan. This technical assistance is provided directly by NJDOE staff and the CAPA teams.
The NCLB school support team process, Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement (CAPA), provides on-the-scene review, consultation and follow-up to schools. http://www.nj.gov/njded/capa/.
The CAPA process (the initial visit, governance visit, and benchmark meetings) is designed to assist schools as follows:

Conduct an initial comprehensive review and needs assessment of all facets of a school's operation. District operations are also evaluated during the initial visit.

Review state-issued AYP and three-year trend data charts along with other school portfolio information to inform the CAPA team during the school review effort, also known as the scholastic audit.

Issue a report to the district that identifies findings and recommendations at the conclusion of the on-site visit. The district presents this report to the school staff and the public at a School Board meeting. The NJDOE posts all the CAPA reports on its Web site.

After the CAPA report is issued, the school/district updates the Title I Unified Plan, incorporating its prioritized CAPA recommendations and action plans to address the identified issues. The prioritized issues are specified and an action plan and budget are developed that includes student achievement data, benchmarks and targets, as well as a plan of action using scientifically based research models.

Three Part (g) technical assistance sessions were provided to 100 districts and schools eligible to receive the grant to review expectations and present a showcase of effective practices.
With the assistance of the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center, an evaluation document was developed as a guideline for reviewing the implementation and impact of the services delivered by school and district staff members and providers to schools receiving a School Improvement Part (g) grant. The standards describe four levels of performance in several areas of support for schools along with examples of indicators and evidence for assessing each area. These standards are intended to be comprehensive and may include practices that are not provided by all programs/providers. The expectations of the providers and programs are that the providers will work collaboratively with the schools to build their capacity to implement and sustain the effective practices using school resources. The assessment is based upon evidence provided by the provider or district and school.
A portion of the workshop for schools in need of improvement to prepare for completion of the school improvement plan (Title I Unified Plan) included how to plan for a Part (g) grant.

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.

CAPA is a professional learning opportunity for district and school staff members who participate as members on the CAPA team. The CAPA team membership usually includes NJDOE staff, outside experts, the principal from the school and district and school representatives from language arts literacy and mathematics. Special education and bilingual education team members are added if indicated. A thoughtful, systematic and evidence-based approach is used to reach agreement about the strengths and the changes needed to make a positive difference in teaching and learning. At the conclusion of the visit, the entire team develops a report of findings and recommendations that will be provided to the district and school. The Division of District and School Improvement (DSI) and the Division of Field Services is funded with state monies. The mission of both divisions is to provide guidance, support and resources to assist districts and schools in meeting the high-quality standards established by the New Jersey State Board of Education. The scope of work centers on improvement in the five key areas of school district effectiveness identified in the New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (QSAC) as: Instruction and Program, Personnel, Operations Management, Fiscal Management and Governance, as well as the school-level standards established by the Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) process. These divisions work collaboratively with other department program offices and external organizations to deliver high-quality supports and resources to districts and schools. Efforts are aligned with the paradigm shift of the department's work with districts from compliance to assistance, building capacity and improvement. Specific activities of involvement include providing professional development and technical assistance to schools and districts in need of improvement, developing and implementing efficient methods of communicating improvement activities, establishing a resource of materials to prepare schools and districts for monitoring and assisting with the continuous improvement of the QSAC monitoring. Title I SINIs have access to the expertise provided by The Turnaround Leadership Professional Learning Community Network, a professional development initiative to create collegial networks for school leaders across the state. The initiative fosters the abilities of educational leaders by providing opportunities to enhance and hone leadership skills. Through an established partnership with Montclair State University (Northern Region), The College of New Jersey (Central Region), and Rowan University (Southern Region), the network works to assist new and veteran educational leaders, as well as those in schools in years three to five of NCLB corrective action status. Partnering with these universities, members of the network discuss theoretical concepts of leadership as well as practical applications with their fellow administrators in the field.

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	128,610
Applied to transfer	1,245
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	835

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	$ 146,499

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	144

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

 - In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

   For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

[3] Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	124,543
Applied for supplemental educational services	27,543
Received supplemental educational services	21,262
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	$ 28,025,156
Comments: We have made a comprehensive effort to increase SES enrollment and the numbers that were reported by the districts may be realistic. Below are some of the factors that may have influenced the numbers last year: • We have shifted the focus of the state relationship from compliance to increased TA and individual district support. (This was the priority woven into all of our duties.) • The average student PPA increased approximately $400 per eligible student, thereby increasing the dollar amount by default. • In response to 2008 EWEG reallocation amendments, we implemented higher accountability expectations for district implementation and required dedicated use. • We also required a few districts to return unused or inappropriately spent SES funds. • We saw a decrease in district reporting in 2008. The 2009 numbers have proportionally returned to a reasonable level (still, they indicate an increase in service to eligible students). • SES is becoming more stable as a key requirement of Title I schools in year 2 and up. Therefore, more districts understand that they are required to implement the program. • More districts went into status. • General Title I monitoring provided higher accountability measures during on-site visits. • SES providers have aggressively marketed services to parents, thus increasing awareness of the option. • More districts are conducting SES Parent/Provider Fairs.	

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	355,154	353,952	99.7	1,202	0.3
All elementary classes	232,361	231,735	99.7	626	0.3
All secondary classes	122,793	122,217	99.5	576	0.5
Response to the Federal Review: NJ has submitted all of the files at all of the levels that were required. In particular, we show school, district, state level acceptances for N063 (Elementary) and N064 (Secondary) for Teacher Quality in September 09. For CSPR Section 1.5.3 the N103 has the poverty ranking and all three levels of that were done as well.					

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.

In elementary classes, a full-day self contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and*
government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core
academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this
determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1*
through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who
maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided*
to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more
than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via
a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate
units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and
Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are*
responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements
for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been
classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or
middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count*
self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g.,
mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a
departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each
subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject*
taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the
denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained
classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history,
he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters,*
quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes
should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are <u>not highly qualified</u>, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided <u>at each grade level</u> are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes <u>at a particular grade</u> 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 <u>for each grade</u> 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 <u>not</u> highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	82.3
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	13.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	3.9
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other -Certified Teacher of Students with Disabilities has not completed campanion instructional endorsement.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	24.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	67.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	8.5
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other -Certified Teacher of Students with Disabilities has not completed campanion instructional endorsement.

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	70,543	69,774	98.9
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	52,868	52,680	99.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	30,800	30,206	98.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	32,695	32,610	99.7

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	46.0	3.9
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	31.1	3.8
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

    a. *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.*

    b. *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.*

    c. *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.*

    d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Mandarin, Portuguese, Korean
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Haitian Creole
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Portuguese
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other language assistance program models that are implemented in New Jersey include bilingual resource room, high intensity ESL, bilingual tutorial and part-time bilingual education.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined 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	54,150
Comments:	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the underlined 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.	52,513
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	36,268
Arabic	1,410
Portuguese	1,366
Korean	1,197
Haitian; Haitian Creole	1,125

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	54,049
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	101
Total	54,150
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	13,478
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	24.9
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	52,418
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	95
Total	52,513
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	24,955

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of ôMaking Progressö as defined by the State and**
   submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of ôMaking Progressö and the number and**
   percent that met the State definition of ôAttainmentö 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	22,645	29.5	20,590	75.00
ELP attainment	49,359	64.3	38,879	75.00
Comments: The percentage in the results are incorrectly auto-calculated. EdFacts uses the sum of three figures in the N050 as the denominator. We consider this calculation an error. These are two separate calculations. Progress is measured by those that have two data points only and the the ELP attainment is measured over 4 and 5 year cohorts. These percentages should be 82.5% for progress and 95.2% for attainment.				

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).	Yes
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,883	4,708	10,591
Comments:		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,591	6,615	62.5	3,976
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,586	5,166	48.8	5,420
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
3,168	2,527	79.8	641
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	203
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	189
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	189
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	203
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	203
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	2
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
# - Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	0
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	Yes
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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
39,784	13,410	68

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	3,493
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	200

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 <u>additional</u> teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do <u>not</u> include the number of teachers <u>currently</u> working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	157	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	276	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	157	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	157	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	156	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	295	232
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	295	322
PD provided to principals	295	13
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	295	342
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	295	83
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	295	992

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reason the numbers of subgrantees in some of the boxes above exceed the total number of subgrantees in section 1.6.4.1 is that they include districts that were participants in consortia, not just the lead districts. For the "other" category,the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) offered regional workshops on how to use the student data warehouse, NJSMART, and its tool, EdAnalyzer, to view and analyze limited English proficient student assessment data and assess student performance in order to make evidence-based decisions about teaching and instruction. In addition, the NJDOE collaborated with The New Jersey Immigration Policy Network (NJIPN)and the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network in offering a training program to empower immigrant parents to participate in the decision making process regarding their children's education. The training aimed to: 1) facilitate and assist immigrant parents in their relationship with schools officials and all aspects of the education system; and 2) to advocate for the success of English Language Lerner (ELL) children attending public schools and establish partnerships and collaborative efforts in order to have a positive impact on the school experience of their children. During 2008-9 439 parents in 13 school districts and 3 community centers in the north, central and south regions of the state were trained.

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 <u>intended school year</u>. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/1/08	9/5/08	60
Comments: For the 2008-2009 school year, the FY 2009 consolidated NCLB application was not available to districts until September 5. This was due to a 6 week lapse in the contract with our vendor (from 7/1/08 to mid-August). The applications were due 10/28/08 for a project period of 9/1/08 -8/31/09. The first application received final NJDOE approval on 12/12/08 and approximately 70% were approved within 90 days of submission.		

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

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

We are targeting the FY2010 NCLB application to be available in late May 2010. Applications will be due in mid-August and thus districts will be able to receive their money much earlier in the school year.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: Edfacts file N130 has been submitted but has populateded as Blank. The number of schools is zero.	

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	95.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	89.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic	90.7
Hispanic	88.3
White, non-Hispanic	96.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	93.4
Female	94.8
Comments: For Graduates: Children with disabilities rate is missing (will report by 2010-11 when we have the first cohort available from NJ SMART). The LEP, Economically disadvantaged, and Migratory rates are missing.	

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 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.

The department still uses the NCES leaver rate from our aggregate collection for calculating the state's graduation rate. Only regular diploma holders are counted as graduates. Dropouts over four years are added back to the graduates and they are not counted as transfers. The department will publish the leaver rate as its transition method until 2010-11 when the first NCLB adjusted cohort rate will be produced from the student-level data using the 2007 first-time freshmen as the first cohort. In 2010-11, all of the subgroups will be represented.

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	1.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3.2
Hispanic	3.1
White, non-Hispanic	1.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.9
Limited English proficient	4.7
Economically disadvantaged	1.9
Migratory students	0.0
Male	2.1
Female	1.6
Comments: Migatory-none reported	

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	650	609
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	658	617
Comments:		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	350	159
K	618	112
1	579	121
2	549	118
3	537	106
4	512	134
5	471	129
6	394	126
7	439	117
8	426	109
9	461	119
10	368	72
11	301	92
12	302	59
Ungraded		N<12
Total	6,307	1,583
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,606	874
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,878	650
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	31	2
Hotels/Motels	792	57
Total	6,307	1,583
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	76
K	66
1	72
2	55
3	51
4	53
5	65
6	50
7	42
8	64
9	62
10	42
11	44
12	29
Ungraded	N<12
Total	781
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	94
Migratory children/youth	N<12
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	85
Limited English proficient students	21
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	8
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	7
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

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

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	131	39
4	73	24
5	80	35
6	67	27
7	63	25
8	56	32
High School	67	32
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	131	55
4	73	31
5	80	47
6	67	28
7	62	29
8	55	25
High School	66	25
	Comments:	

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	159
K	101
1	144
2	140
3	111
4	110
5	82
6	71
7	67
8	45
9	52
10	33
11	33
12	19
Ungraded	N<12
Out-of-school	862
Total	2,031
Comments:	

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 relatively small number of students reported for Category 1 results in a greater proportional impact on the totals, at certain grade levels.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> 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 <u>not</u> include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs

- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	99
K	53
1	82
2	89
3	63
4	49
5	43
6	46
7	32
8	18
9	29
10	15
11	15
12	N<12
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	476
Total	1,110
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Significantly atypical weather patterns in the Spring and early summer resulted in a very abbreviated harvestng season for many crops in New Jersey in 2009. Consequently a sizeable number of migrant families bypassed the state to seek work further north.

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.

NJ MEP uses COEstar system to compile and generate data related to migrant students in both Category I & II programs.

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.

Data collected relevant to the Childcount includes: the COE (4 specific elements: the QAD residency, date, current address/state and student's date of birth); school or program enrollment including the school term school year enrollment and withdrawal dates from the program; LEP assessment needs assessment and graduation/termination data; and instructional and supportive services program data including the type of program and funding source.

Recruiters collect data at the time a new COE is completed. Formal mailings are made to the school districts requesting additional information such as enrollment verification supplemental program participation special education data updated health records test scores promotion data completion of at-risk surveys etc. For students entering the area after mass enrollment is completed in the fall the local regional projects contact school districts to verify enrollment For pre-schoolers not attending a school or program and for non-attending young adults lists are generated by district and are given to the appropriate recruiter for verification. The recruiter then calls or visits the homes of the children/youth in order to verify that they still reside in the area. All data relating to summer services are documented through daily attendance records tutor logs nurse's health logs reports and receipts for services staff monthly reports and activity logs health referral forms pre-and post-test records summaries of student progress instructional service according to what each site provided and what each child actually received. Site directors student records clerks nurses recruiters teachers and other summer staff are involved in collecting maintaining and forwarding these data to the data management specialist for recording in the database.

COEstar is an integrated component of our data collection system and data is collected throughout the entire year.

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.

COEstar is our primary filing system for student information from the COE to the collection of services. Although data are inputted both manually and through electronic COEs no data is entered into our database until the COE is verified by the regional migrant education project director. COEstar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to provide the Childcount and additional reports for the Performance Report submitted by the New Jersey Department of Education.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A The data are not collected or maintained differently.

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.

Children who were between age 3 through 21

As a result COEstar's ability to keep electronic copies of the official state Certificate of Eligibility all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the accounts are performed. Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edits checks on data as it is entered the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of test on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source.

As COEstar keeps a copy of the actual COE calculation of eligibility is relativity simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he/she can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times(even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility).

By virtue of completing a COe the stat is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulations. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.

COEstar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were within 3 years of a last qualifying move had a qualifying activity);

The information collected by the recruiter through the interview process and recorded on the COE is verified by the program director prior to being entered in the COEstar database and monitored by TROMIK.

-Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September1 through August 31);

TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to confirm that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would verify that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the school year listed on the school enrollment records QAD dates residency dates enrollment dates withdrawal dates departure dates needs assessment and graduation/termination dates special services dates and health record dates performed in this state during the period.

-Children who in the case of Category 2-received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Entry of this data means that the State served during the summer/intersession term. Additionally services information can be added to indicate the nature of services; however the summer/intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service begin.

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

COEstar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state region county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level eligible children are counted only once statewide in each eligible category. Upon the process of data entry at the regional level the data specialist scans the consolidated data base to look for duplicates. Prior to student information being added to the COEstar system a search is conducted to determine whether the student record already exists. In the instance a duplicate is found the record is not entered into the data base. Additionally all COEs are thoroughly inspected and reviewed by the regional program director as an ongoing practice to ensure quality assurance.

Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in School wide programs and TAS programs funded by MEP in both

regular and summer/intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

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.

In order to verify that children included in the two Childcounts meet the eligibility criteria (according to 34 CFR22.40) all COEs are reviewed and approved by regional project directors before data is entered into the student information system. For children enrolled in a prior year but still eligible to be counted safeguards are built into the COEstar system to ensure that no child is counted who reached end of eligibility prior to the beginning of the service period. As part of mass enrollment lists of preschoolers and nonattending young adults are generated and recruiters must verify by home visit or telephone that these children and youth are still residing in the area as of September 1. Training is provided to data managers/specialists by their respective program directors. In addition the New Jersey Department of Education's contract with TROMICK Technology includes extensive and ongoing training and technical assistance to the regional subgrantees in the area of data collection. The COE is a standard document used by our MEP subgrantees in both the northern and southern regions of the state which allows a level of conformity between the two regions and throughout the state. Finally the state has provided written guidance on eligibility; which is reviewed annually and reinforced during trainings and monitors the regional migrant programs which includes conducting random audits of COEs and migrant lists for eligibility determinations.

*We should note that COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Once verified each COE can be marked as verified and locked; invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NJ MEP, during the 2008-2009 period, implemented the following procedures and processes to ensure optimal quality control central to the accuracy of eligibility decisions:

 -An annual sample review was conducted by the NJ MEP, in which the MEP coordinator reviewed 100 randomly sampled COEs to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. Of the 100 COEs reviewed, 96 were found to be eligible.

-Regional MEP project directors in-serviced staff during scheduled trainings, providing "debriefing" activities to ensure thorough knowledge of eligibility and related ID/R issues.

-Recruiters "shadowed" peers in critiquingthe recruiting process

-State coordinator/ID&R coordinator accompanied recruiters in the field to more actively assess performance and offer guidance in ID&R

-2008-2009 program year trainings which included: o Interpersonal skills and communication; o Cultural sensitivity; o Interviewing protocol and strategies; o Eligibility determination process (including the interpretation of complex scenarios); and o Recording and maintaining appropriate documentation

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New Jersey Department of Education is committed to ensuring that its system of data collection is reliable and accurate. Measures to ensure the integrity of data collection for the Migrant Education Program specifically the Childcount Data will be scrutinized at the highest level. Checks and balances have and will continue to be incorporated into this process through a comprehensive system to include: appropriate ID&R training random audits of COEs and the quarterly review of all regional MEP data by the migrant director and state coordinator.

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?

As mentioned previously New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process. Finally SFA staff review and verify all counts with the regional project directors/project staff and TROMIK for accuracy prior to submission to ED.

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 corrective actions that will be made to improve the accuracy of New Jersey's MEP eligibility determinations include: utilizing the comments section to provide additional information which will enable those reviewing the COE to have information necessary in making eligbility information and ensuring a more thorough review of QADs.

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.

N/A