

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 YORK



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p style="text-align: center;">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</p>		
<p>Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2008-09 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2008-09</p>		
<p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: New York State Education Department</p>		
<p>Address: 89 Washington Avenue Albany, New York 12234</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Person to contact about this report:</p>		
<p>Name: Ken Wagner</p>		
<p>Telephone: (518) 474-7965</p>		
<p>Fax: (518) 474-4351</p>		
<p>e-mail: kwagner@mail.nysed.gov</p>		
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Alan Ray</p>		
		<p style="text-align: center;">Friday, March 12, 2010, 10:23:42 AM</p>
<p>Signature</p>		<p>Date</p>

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The New York State Learning Standards for English language arts (ELA), mathematics and science were adopted by the Board of Regents in 1996. In 2005, the NYS Learning Standard for Mathematics was reviewed and revised with a grade by grade articulation of student expectations (P-12). Also, in 2005 the ELA standards were reviewed but not revised. The four ELA standards remained intact with a grade by grade (P-12) articulation of student expectations. This level of specificity was in response to the NCLB mandate for states to develop grade 3-8 content standards and related state assessments.

Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2007 of the State of New York required that the Regents periodically review and evaluate the existing learning standards to determine if they should be strengthened, modified or combined to provide adequate opportunity for students to acquire the skills and knowledge they need to succeed in employment or postsecondary education and to function productively as civic participants upon graduation from high school. Such review and evaluation shall be conducted upon a schedule adopted by the Regents, provided that a review and evaluation of the ELA standards shall be completed as soon as possible, but no later than the end of the 2007-08 school year.

At the July 2007 Board of Regents meeting, Chancellor Bennett asked Regent Cohen to lead a Steering Committee in the review of the standards starting with ELA. The Standards Review Initiative includes the steering committee, a research team of academic experts, and panels of content experts including teachers and administrators. In the review of the ELA standards, the research team works with the content panel and Department staff. A perpetual standards review process has been proposed to ensure that the learning standards are systemically reviewed, updated, and improved on a regular schedule.

In October 2007, the Board of Regents approved a time table for the review and revision of the learning standards starting with ELA. The review of the ELA standards began in November 2007. The review and recommendations for revision of the standards was completed in the summer of 2008. The revision of the standards began in September 2008 and has not yet been completed. The development of the ELA assessments is scheduled to begin soon after the adoption of the ELA standards.

The time table for the review and revision of the remaining learning standards was placed on hold given the duration of the current economic recession.

In December 2009, The Board of Regents approved a timeline and plan for the review, adoption, and implementation of the Common Core State Standards in ELA and mathematics. This plan consists of four phases. The four phases are:

Phase I: Public Review and Comment NGA/CCSSO ELA/Mathematics Standards (December 2009 -February 2010)

Phase II: Propose a revised set of NYS Learning Standards for ELA/Mathematics (March 2010 -April 2010)

Phase III: Public Review, Comment and Adoption of NYS Learning Standards for ELA and Mathematics (April 2010 -July 2010)

Phase IV: Design ELA and Mathematics curriculum frameworks, align professional development and pre-service education, and integrate new standards into virtual high school. (Revise/create standards in other subjects, beginning with science and social studies.)

Implementation of the Board of Regents approved ELA and Mathematics Standards will include development of curriculum frameworks, alignment of professional development and pre-service education as well as opportunity for online coursework through the development of a virtual high school. As resources become available, the Department will engage the field in the revision of all NYS learning standards with priority given to science and social studies. Although this process will be ongoing, the Department expects the initial set of all curriculum frameworks to be completed by August 2014 as per New York State's Race to the Top application.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to mathematics or ELA assessments have been taken. However, the ELA and mathematics standards are currently under review. Following the review and approval of the these standards, newly developed ELA and mathematics assessments will be aligned with the revised standards. The anticipated date for the implementation of the revised ELA and mathematics standards is scheduled for July 2010.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessment and/or academic achievement standards have been taken. However, the Department has tentatively scheduled the review of the science standards for 2011-12. Following the review and approval of these standards, newly developed science assessments will be aligned with the revised standards. The anticipated date for the implementation of the revised science standards is scheduled for the 2015-16 school year.
--

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	1,429,639		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,414		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	109,688		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	272,634		>97%
Hispanic	294,680		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	742,748		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	228,006		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	97,860		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	690,291		>97%
Migratory students	833		>97%
Male	732,386		>97%
Female	697,253		>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	39,001	17.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	172,489	75.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	17,320	7.6
Total	228,810	
Comments: Different business rules were used to extract data for the 093 and 081 files. The data reporting office is working with the IDEA program office to align business rules. We will work to have this resolved by the re-certification.		

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	1,428,744		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,410		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	109,220		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	272,546		>97%
Hispanic	294,305		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	742,865		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	228,224		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	97,025		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	690,125		>97%
Migratory students	833		>97%
Male	731,829		>97%
Female	696,915		>97%
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	38,323	17.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	171,842	76.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	15,878	7.0
Total	226,043	
Comments: Different business rules were used to extract data for the 093 and 081 files. The data reporting office is working with the IDEA program office to align business rules. We will work to have this resolved by the re-certification.		

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	414,798		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,947	1,881	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	31,347		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	79,761		>97%
Hispanic	87,499		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	213,295		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	69,380	66,567	96.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,524		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	207,077		>97%
Migratory students	239		>97%
Male	213,522		>97%
Female	201,276		>97%
Comments: Science is assessed at grades 4 and 8.			

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	30,255	45.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30,973	46.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,919	7.4
Total	66,147	
Comments: Different business rules were used to extract data for the 093 and 081 files. The data reporting office is working with the IDEA program office to align business rules. We will work to have this resolved by the re-certification.		

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

	# 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
Grade 3			
All students	202,389	188,070	92.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	924	830	89.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,581	16,127	97.3
Black, non-Hispanic	38,314	33,360	87.1
Hispanic	43,826	39,398	89.9
White, non-Hispanic	102,028	97,677	95.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,080	24,168	75.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,248	17,090	84.4
Economically disadvantaged students	106,813	95,777	89.7
Migratory students	154	124	80.5
Male	104,147	96,148	92.3
Female	98,242	91,922	93.6
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 3			
All students	202,117	152,986	75.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	921	609	66.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,493	14,235	86.3
Black, non-Hispanic	38,307	24,364	63.6
Hispanic	43,751	27,819	63.6
White, non-Hispanic	101,942	85,380	83.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,046	12,636	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,125	9,687	48.1
Economically disadvantaged students	106,768	70,375	65.9
Migratory students	156	73	46.8
Male	103,973	74,420	71.6
Female	98,144	78,566	80.0
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 3			
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

	# 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
Grade 4			
All students	199,999	174,365	87.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	901	747	82.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,283	14,650	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	38,345	29,824	77.8
Hispanic	43,078	35,373	82.1
White, non-Hispanic	101,828	93,287	91.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,591	20,959	62.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,909	12,099	71.6
Economically disadvantaged students	104,628	85,563	81.8
Migratory students	130	90	69.2
Male	103,220	89,615	86.8
Female	96,779	84,750	87.6
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 4			
All students	199,921	153,329	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	904	624	69.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,255	13,049	85.5
Black, non-Hispanic	38,322	24,963	65.1
Hispanic	42,984	27,731	64.5
White, non-Hispanic	101,906	86,525	84.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,585	13,614	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,752	7,025	41.9
Economically disadvantaged students	104,634	69,612	66.5
Migratory students	129	65	50.4
Male	103,139	75,959	73.6
Female	96,782	77,370	79.9
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 4			
All students	199,248	175,529	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	900	781	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,330	14,217	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	38,052	30,006	78.9
Hispanic	42,931	34,025	79.3
White, non-Hispanic	101,456	95,977	94.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,221	23,406	70.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,845	10,629	63.1
Economically disadvantaged students	104,014	84,640	81.4
Migratory students	130	102	78.5
Male	102,773	90,453	88.0
Female	96,475	85,076	88.2
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 CSPA collection tool.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -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
Grade 5			
All students	201,959	177,923	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	929	790	85.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,313	14,660	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	38,881	30,507	78.5
Hispanic	42,951	35,747	83.2
White, non-Hispanic	103,330	95,744	92.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,055	22,548	64.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,645	10,199	69.6
Economically disadvantaged students	104,066	86,141	82.8
Migratory students	110	74	67.3
Male	103,500	90,459	87.4
Female	98,459	87,464	88.8
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 5			
All students	201,824	165,360	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	927	720	77.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,224	13,398	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	38,834	27,303	70.3
Hispanic	42,866	30,452	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	103,429	93,033	90.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,068	17,921	51.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,462	6,233	43.1
Economically disadvantaged students	104,003	76,169	73.2
Migratory students	108	68	63.0
Male	103,394	82,828	80.1
Female	98,430	82,532	83.8
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 5			
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

	# 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
Grade 6			
All students	202,219	168,029	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	907	688	75.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,532	14,565	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	39,029	27,369	70.1
Hispanic	42,081	31,121	74.0
White, non-Hispanic	104,180	93,869	90.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,331	17,931	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,711	6,840	53.8
Economically disadvantaged students	101,370	76,193	75.2
Migratory students	125	72	57.6
Male	104,027	84,910	81.6
Female	98,192	83,119	84.6
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 6			
All students	201,911	162,474	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	909	678	74.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,415	13,541	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	38,962	26,996	69.3
Hispanic	41,988	28,880	68.8
White, non-Hispanic	104,163	91,976	88.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,327	15,988	46.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,555	4,462	35.5
Economically disadvantaged students	101,235	72,028	71.2
Migratory students	123	69	56.1
Male	103,841	80,216	77.2
Female	98,070	82,258	83.9
Comments: The percentage of students scoring at or above proficient increased for each subgroup.			

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

	# 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
Grade 6			
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

	# 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
Grade 7			
All students	207,098	180,718	87.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	943	785	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,722	14,833	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	39,287	29,531	75.2
Hispanic	42,816	33,730	78.8
White, non-Hispanic	107,906	101,473	94.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,061	21,319	60.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,161	7,138	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	101,063	81,150	80.3
Migratory students	116	91	78.4
Male	106,780	92,047	86.2
Female	100,318	88,671	88.4
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 7			
All students	207,024	165,659	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	941	698	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,608	13,331	85.4
Black, non-Hispanic	39,284	26,429	67.3
Hispanic	42,774	28,343	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	108,002	96,511	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,152	16,425	46.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,006	3,389	28.2
Economically disadvantaged students	101,097	70,216	69.4
Migratory students	117	71	60.7
Male	106,712	82,135	77.0
Female	100,312	83,524	83.3
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 7			
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

	# 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
Grade 8			
All students	211,828	169,962	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,015	755	74.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,834	14,542	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	40,567	25,648	63.2
Hispanic	43,587	30,285	69.5
White, non-Hispanic	110,476	98,455	89.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,471	16,823	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,349	6,602	53.5
Economically disadvantaged students	101,418	71,600	70.6
Migratory students	104	73	70.2
Male	108,497	85,213	78.5
Female	103,331	84,749	82.0
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 8			
All students	211,893	145,054	68.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,010	566	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,744	12,332	78.3
Black, non-Hispanic	40,594	21,267	52.4
Hispanic	43,546	22,821	52.4
White, non-Hispanic	110,657	87,816	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,545	10,263	29.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,181	2,151	17.7
Economically disadvantaged students	101,443	55,613	54.8
Migratory students	105	48	45.7
Male	108,556	69,214	63.8
Female	103,337	75,840	73.4
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 8			
All students	208,751	149,097	71.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	981	638	65.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,769	12,708	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	39,415	18,465	46.8
Hispanic	42,684	21,461	50.3
White, non-Hispanic	109,548	95,558	87.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,346	14,102	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,075	2,847	23.6
Economically disadvantaged students	99,223	54,473	54.9
Migratory students	103	63	61.2
Male	106,675	76,646	71.8
Female	102,076	72,451	71.0
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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -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
High School			
All students	188,578	167,562	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	728	603	82.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,512	13,884	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	33,433	25,633	76.7
Hispanic	32,403	26,010	80.3
White, non-Hispanic	107,204	101,166	94.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,356	12,486	55.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,741	5,450	70.4
Economically disadvantaged students	67,672	55,375	81.8
Migratory students	82	74	90.2
Male	93,813	82,343	87.8
Female	94,765	85,219	89.9
Comments:			

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

	# 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
High School			
All students	186,011	168,874	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	698	607	87.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,351	13,533	94.3
Black, non-Hispanic	32,607	26,908	82.5
Hispanic	31,653	26,545	83.9
White, non-Hispanic	106,407	101,012	94.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,216	12,751	60.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,194	4,520	62.8
Economically disadvantaged students	66,219	56,055	84.6
Migratory students	77	67	87.0
Male	92,008	81,643	88.7
Female	94,003	87,231	92.8
Comments:			

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	4,548	4,016	88.3
Districts	841	800	95.1
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	3,262	2,840	87.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,604	1,264	78.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,658	1,576	95.0
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
782	753	96.3
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 ¹ Year 1, School Improvement ¹ Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	45
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	45
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	22
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.

Dramatic change in school structure, organization, or curriculum, to affect change in the area(s) for which the school was identified. These changes can include grade reconfiguration or truncation, implementation of Small Learning Communities and/or freshman academies, adoption of a research-based whole school reform model or new curriculum, etc. School restructurings are intensely supported and monitored by the New York City Regional School Support Center (funded by SED) and the NYCDOE.

The above numbers are reflective of NYC data only.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Consistent with Section 6316A(10)(C)(ii) of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) requires school districts that are identified for corrective action to conduct an audit of their written, tested, and taught curriculum by an external evaluator. These districts are also required to prepare and provide NYSED with a district Action Plan that details how the recommended corrective actions identified through the audit will be implemented. The NYSED provides these designated districts with a protocol and template, which outlines the steps that a district must undertake in order to be in compliance with this requirement. Additionally, leadership staffs from these districts are invited to a meeting during which this requirement is discussed and each of the required steps is summarized, including implementation timelines, strategies, and fiscal support. Following is a description of the format that designated districts are required to include in their audit. NCLB DINI CORRECTIVE ACTION FORMAT FOR AUDIT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION AND PLAN OF ACTION Required Components The Audit of Curriculum and Instruction, unless otherwise approved by SED, will pertain only to the subject(s) in which the district has been identified for Corrective Action: English Language Arts and/or mathematics. In instances where a district is identified for only specific subpopulations, and achievement for all other populations is strong, the Audit of Curriculum and Instruction may focus on that specific subpopulation. The report must address the grade level(s) and subpopulations for which the district failed to make Adequate Yearly progress. To the extent appropriate, the report should include all grade levels, from Pre-K through high school and all NCLB identified subgroups, and examine the education of all district students, regardless of program placement, with particular attention to at-risk subpopulations. Additionally, the report must include an analysis of the learning environment and school culture including, policies to provide a safe, equitable and orderly learning environment. Recommendations must meet all applicable State Education Department (SED) regulations and requirements, including addressing mastery of all learning standards in the identified area(s). The auditors should meet early in the process with the district to determine what plans, documents, etc. should be reviewed, and who should be interviewed/observed. Auditors must complete class visits as part of the audit. Selected auditors are required to attend a meeting with State Education Department staff regarding the expectations for the conduct of an Audit of Curriculum and Instruction. SED may also invite to this meeting as appropriate representatives of Regional School Support Centers and other network representatives. The report may not make recommendations that conflict with applicable State or Federal laws or regulations or with local collective bargaining agreements. The report, while it may highlight constraints beyond district control, should include recommendations that are "actionable" and "doable" in light of the realities of district fiscal constraints. The school district must be given at a minimum at least one opportunity to review and comment upon The Report and recommendations before the final documents are submitted to the district and the State Education Department. The Plan of Action developed by the school district must be based on the recommendations contained in the audit and should be longterm, for at least three years, with a timeline that delineates action steps across years. Implementation of the plan of action must commence by September with the start of the XX school year. Unless the district receives permission from the State Education Department, the district must include in its Plan of Action a strategy to fully implement each of the recommendations contained in the auditor's report. Upon SED's approval of the district's plan of action, the district must incorporate the plan of action into the district's Consolidated Application, CDEP or DCEP, and/or partnership agreement. Failure to complete the Audit of Curriculum and Instruction process or to successfully implement the approved Plan of Action will subject the district to additional State mandated corrective actions.

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	33
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	
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	7	1
Schools	18	10
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	02/11/10
---	----------

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	153,243	
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	107,971	
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	70.5	
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	152,092	
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	89,760	
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	59.0	
Comments: SY 2007-08 data was not supplied by the program office in order to complete this column.		

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	151
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	3
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	245
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		420	117	135	C	
2		422	117	135	C	
3		412	117	137	C	
4		411	117	138	C	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Effective strategies and practices are shared with districts and schools through a myriad of venues.

-Face-to-face monthly School Improvement Networking meetings (audience of approximately 125 individuals, representing all arms of technical support available to districts and schools) employ esteemed speakers who share effective strategies and practices. Instructional materials and handouts, books for the professional libraries, are disseminated. Speakers from the SED and various office and divisions of the NYCDOE present latest research-based findings and share effective practices from internal data collection within NYC, as well.

-SED works directly with schools, District Leadership Teams, School Support Organizations and the New York City Regional School Support Center to form a strong network of support to schools.

-Special Reading, Mathematics, Science and ESL Institutes are presented 5 times each year (bi-monthly). The institutes are jointly sponsored by NYSED and NYCDOE, designed to share best practices and effective strategies. The full-day institute includes a keynote speaker, a nationally known and published educator who speaks to the invited small teams from schools that are either Title I SINI schools or Schools Under Registration Review. After the keynote, workshops take place in individual rooms for specialized audiences with special needs, e.g., high school math; middle school; English language arts; ESL practices; special education needs, etc. The institute builds over the year, and the same team from the school is encouraged to attend each session, and by the end of the year, the entire team is armed with research-based, effective strategies and practices that are shared at the school level. District and School Support Personnel also attend these institutes, and they share the same information with schools throughout the year, if those schools did not attend or were not invited because they are schools in good standing.

-As part of the P-16 Initiative, NYSED conducted a series of Urban Forums throughout the State. Over a period of 18 months, five two-day Urban Forums have taken place in the "Big Five" cities in NYS -Rochester, Buffalo, Syracuse, Yonkers and NYC. Each of the forums takes a different focus in the challenge of improving education at all levels from Pre-K through post-secondary education. The forums include guest speakers of renown, panel discussions, workshops, roundtables and other venues, including school visits. Participants include principals, superintendents, district administrators, and teachers. Representatives from the statewide Regional School Support Centers also attend. The contracted technical support agency, New York Comprehensive Center, assisted in the planning of the events, and provided assistance in finding appropriate research-based materials. Participants are encouraged to share information from the Urban Forums with districts and schools by electronic transmissions of materials, and via a website where materials can be accessed.

Audit of Curriculum -1003a

Each year districts in need of improvement (DINIs) in New York State that have moved into Corrective Action under the federal accountability system are required to conduct an Audit of Curriculum under NCLB. This is designed to enable districts in Corrective Action to address identified deficiencies in their curriculum and to implement innovative and specific interventions aimed at improving student performance.

In 2008 the NYS districts newly identified as being in Corrective Action for were East Ramapo and Kingston. Because of this designation both were required to undertake Audits of their Written, Tested and Taught ELA Curriculum. Both school districts chose to use Learning Point Associates to conduct the audits.

1003(g)

-School Quality Reviews (SQR) are required for each school in their first year of identification. The SQR Basic Review requires the school to complete a self-assessment using the NYSED Quality Indicators document. An SQR team, which includes representatives from the various technical support offices, reviews the report and provides written recommendations to each school. The school must address these recommendations in developing their Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP).

-Seven Corrective Action Districts were invited to participate in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Projects based on their high needs and commitment to school reform. STEM is an extended summer learning opportunity program for low income students in grades 6-8.

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.

1003(g)

-School Quality Reviews (SQR) are required for each school in their first year of identification. The SQR Basic Review requires the school to complete a self-assessment using the NYSED Quality Indicators document. An SQR team, which includes representatives from the various technical support offices, reviews the report and provides written recommendations to each school. The school must address these recommendations in developing their Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP).

-Seven Corrective Action Districts were invited to participate in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Projects based on their high needs and commitment to school reform. STEM is an extended summer learning opportunity program for low income students in grades 6-8.

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.

During 2008-09 New York State committed approximately 2 million dollars to support the implementation of our State sponsored Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) process. SURR schools are the lowest performing schools in our state and once identified they are subjected to a comprehensive external review by a team of educators and administrators which culminates in a detailed set of recommendations that they must implement. These LEAs are assigned a State Education Department liaison that monitors them throughout the process to insure that the recommended corrective actions are being implemented. These LEAs are given priority and technical assistance in accessing professional development opportunities and in preparing applications for competitive grants. During the 2007-08 legislative session the state provided funding under Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2007 for the State Education Department to make funds available to low performing LEAs/schools through Contracts for Excellence (C4E). These funds are provided to targeted LEAs to assist them with implementation of school improvement efforts that are reviewed and approved by the NYSED for implementation. This funding was continued for the 2008-09 year. Additionally, NYSED has staff that are designated as liaisons to these LEAs who work closely with them on their implementation plans and assisting them with accessing support services through our statewide networks of Regional School Support Services. State law requires that these districts -those that have at least one school in need of improvement and received an increase in State Foundation Aid above a threshold -enter into "Contracts for Excellence." Contract districts must spend a portion of their Foundation Aid increase on programs and activities that have been shown to improve student achievement and that are focused primarily on students with the greatest educational needs. These districts may use funds for class size reduction; increased time on task; teacher/principal quality initiatives; middle school/high school restructuring; model programs for English language learners; full day pre-kindergarten/kindergarten; and experimental programs. Examples of specific programs to be implemented by the designated districts include: Class Size Reduction: Research has shown that reductions in class size, particularly in the early grades, can improve student achievement. More than three-quarters of the approved Contract for Excellence districts will use at least part of their fund allocations to support these efforts.

Snapshots of some LEAs:

ALBANY CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Middle and High School Restructuring

Albany CSD has committed C4E money district wide to support the hire of a new English as a Second Language Coordinator to oversee instructional programming, and to identify need for both resources and staff development for ESL teachers, at all schools, at all levels.

Increase Time on Task Albany CSD will provide additional support for attendance monitoring at Albany High School through the services of an attendance officer.

Improved Teacher/Principal Quality Albany CSD will provide targeted professional development to improve the quality of instruction to teachers and administrators at Albany High School by the National Urban Alliance for Effective Education (NUA).

Class Size Reduction

Albany CSD is continuing their commitment to maintain smaller class size with a teacher funded through C4E at the Arbor Hill and Giffen Elementary schools and an additional teacher at the high school.

SCHENECTADY CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Reduced Class Size Schenectady CSD has maintained its commitment to add additional staff at the middle and high school level to maintain a student teacher ratio of 18:1.

Schenectady CSD also uses C4E funds to hire additional staff to reduce the case load for academic intervention services enabling students most in need to receive at least one hour of intervention each day in ELA and Math; design and implement a three-day professional development institute in the fall and follow this up with regularly scheduled professional development in the areas of differentiated instruction and teaching literacy in the content areas; add thirty minutes each school day at all schools for all children, 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	298,999
Applied to transfer	10,010
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	3,900

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	\$ 697,295

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	44

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	289,647
Applied for supplemental educational services	98,011
Received supplemental educational services	92,651
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	\$ 119,864,967
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	781,862	759,646	97.2	22,216	2.8
All elementary classes	338,250	332,909	98.4	5,341	1.6
All secondary classes	443,612	426,737	96.2	16,875	3.8

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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.

An elementary teaching assignment can be reported as either one self-contained full-day class or as multiple departmentalized classes. To ensure that these options are equivalent, the State applies a weight to each self-contained full-day elementary class assignment to equate it to an equivalent number of departmentalized elementary class assignments.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	16.4
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	0.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	82.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	6.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	93.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	125,889	120,323	95.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	17,627	17,566	99.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	44,277	39,573	89.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	94,305	93,543	99.2

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	79.2	19.3
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced-Price Lunch	
Secondary schools	74.9	21.3
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced-Price Lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	229,260
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	222,493
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	146,702
Undetermined	12,821
Chinese	6,974
Arabic	5,915
Bengali	5,048

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	196,879
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	17,815
Total	214,694
Comments: The increase in the number of ELLs reported in the "not tested" category this year is due to the fact that NYSED used, for the first time, the state's data warehouse. These numbers are accurate. The ELL program office is consulting with districts to determine why students were not tested and to ensure compliance with testing regulations for future years.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	30,667
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	15.6
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	191,648
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	17,296
Total	208,944
Comments: The increase in the number of ELLs reported in the "not tested" category this year is due to the fact that NYSED used, for the first time, the state's data warehouse. These numbers are accurate. The ELL program office is consulting with districts to determine why students were not tested and to ensure compliance with testing regulations for future years. The 38,939 in the cell below is the number of Title III LEP students who have one data point according to file 138, however, NYS makes a progress determination for all Title III LEP students regardless of the one data point. As a result all Title III LEP students are included in the AMAO 1 calculation.	
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.	43,708

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	128,339	65.5	119,342	61.00
ELP attainment	30,074	15.3	21,716	11.10
Comments: Those numbers based on 195,642 Title III served LEPs who took the 2009 NYSESLAT tests and are accurate.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	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)
Chinese (Traditional)
Haitian Creole
Korean
Russian
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)
Comments: New York State does not administer reading/language arts assessments in languages other-than English.

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)
Chinese (Traditional)
Haitian Creole
Korean
Russian
Spanish
Comments: The High School Regents Examinations are administered in the five languages listed above. Translated versions of the Grades 4 and 8 tests are only available in Chinese (Traditional), Haitian Creole and Spanish.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
19,343	18,678	38,021
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
34,430	30,679	89.1	3,751
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
32,956	27,598	83.7	5,358
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
14,019	11,107	79.2	2,912
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	189
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	160
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	174
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	172
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	176
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	6
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	4
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	19
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	11
Comments: The 11 subgrantees that have not met AMAOs for four consecutive years include 9 that have not met AMAOs for 5 consecutive years. The 4 subgrantees that have not met AMAOs for 2 consecutive years include 2 that have not met AMAOs for 3 consecutive years.	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: NYS met the AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 targets, but did not make the AYP (AMAO 3) in 2008-09 school year.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

- 1. Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
- 2. Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
- 3. 3114(d)(1)Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
25,265	25,265	75

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) ð The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course ð (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.	6,266
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	2,109

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	519	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	377	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	362	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	315	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	314	
Other (Explain in comment box)	168	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	950	3,236
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	541	5,832
PD provided to principals	1,011	1,476
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	928	3,148
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	894	3,537
PD provided to community based organization personnel	213	985
Total	4,537	18,214

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/08	09/1/08	61
Comments:		

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

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

Change our date that the consolidated application is due to NYSED. The current date the application is due is 8/31/09.
An e-grant process that would allow the applications to be electronically.

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	11
Comments: There are 8 additional schools identified as Persistently Dangerous making the total 19 identified schools. The 8 additional schools are not part of the directory and therefore were not included in the 130 file. As a result they are not part of the pre-populated data.	

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	71.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	55.0
Hispanic	51.0
White, non-Hispanic	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	41.0
Limited English proficient	28.0
Economically disadvantaged	57.0
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: We do not have breakdowns by migratory students or by gender.	

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.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.5
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Additional breakouts are not publicly reported by the NYS Education Department.	

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	588	588
LEAs with subgrants	284	284
Total	872	872
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)	1,223	2,045
K	2,335	3,750
1	2,400	4,302
2	2,112	3,843
3	1,894	3,254
4	1,757	3,242
5	1,599	3,028
6	1,686	3,135
7	1,679	3,013
8	1,680	3,310
9	3,246	4,588
10	4,168	3,752
11	1,793	2,691
12	1,823	2,654
Ungraded	13	102
Total	29,408	46,709
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	10,231	18,465
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	8,176	12,953
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	4,047	4,678
Hotels/Motels	467	864
Total	22,921	36,960

Comments: NYC Department of Education did not specify the temporary housing type for 6,482 students in community school districts that received subgrants and 9,749 students in community school districts that did not receive subgrants, for a total of 16,321 students. These students were all designated as unaccompanied youth, but no further data was included about what type of temporary housing they were living in. Also Harlem Success Charter School and St. Hope Leadership Charter School did not specify the housing status for the 2 and 3 students that they respectively identified as homeless.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	3,137
1	3,990
2	3,696
3	3,188
4	3,008
5	2,723
6	2,563
7	2,503
8	2,157
9	2,989
10	1,920
11	1,171
12	1,011
Ungraded	732
Total	34,788
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	19,500
Migratory children/youth	88
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,963
Limited English proficient students	3,864
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	60
Expedited evaluations	43
Staff professional development and awareness	63
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	42
Transportation	58
Early childhood programs	50
Assistance with participation in school programs	63
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	59
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	60
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	63
Coordination between schools and agencies	65
Counseling	57
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	55
Clothing to meet a school requirement	55
School supplies	66
Referral to other programs and services	65
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	57
Other (optional – in comment box below)	34
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

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	15
School Selection	13
Transportation	29
School records	20
Immunizations	15
Other medical records	11
Other Barriers – in comment box below	12

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESL screening for proper placement can take a few days due to scheduling and lack of staff for screening; the lack of transportation to preschool programs, to summer school, and after the student becomes permanent housed; problems arranging transportation to Charter Schools; questions over guardianship and joint custody situations; delays arose where there was a special education placement outside of school district of current location; difficulties getting school placements after youth incarceration or with youth with order of protection against him; occasional difficulties getting transportation for teen pregnant or parenting girls to attend regional educational programs (BOCES) designed for such students; language and cultural barriers; some schools are still unaware or unwilling to accept students who qualify for MV entitlements; communication between agencies providing services to homeless students; having the students/parents leaving the Shelters/Hotels without allowing the School to know their whereabouts.

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	2,125	1,096
4	2,111	1,121
5	1,966	1,215
6	1,858	1,108
7	1,803	961
8	1,622	639
High School	776	579
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	2,137	1,726
4	2,122	1,478
5	1,972	1,399
6	1,870	1,080
7	1,801	1,127
8	1,614	806
High School	829	569
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	616
K	222
1	213
2	183
3	166
4	163
5	120
6	132
7	105
8	114
9	112
10	85
11	62
12	37
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	3,281
Total	5,619
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	443
K	181
1	154
2	131
3	122
4	109
5	96
6	91
7	71
8	88
9	81
10	69
11	42
12	7
Ungraded	N<5
Out-of-school	1,558
Total	3,246
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.

Not applicable.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Migrant Education Program has been using the Management Information Systems-2000 (MIS-2000) since 1997. This system tabulates the Category 1 & 2 counts.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category one migrant child count was based solely on certificate of eligibility's(COE's)completed on migrant children that qualified and and were identified in New York State between September 1, 2008 and August 31, 2009 by the migrant education recruiters. Recruiters go to farms, agribusinesses, neighborhoods, schools, human services agencies, local Migrant Education Outreach Programs, etc. to obtain leads on individual and families who may be eligible for the New York State Migrant Education Program. They then locate and interview individuals and families to ascertain if they moved for qualifying temporary or seasonal qualifying agricultural/fishing activities within the past 36 months across school district lines, that the move was not for permanent relocation, that the qualifying work obtained was out of economic necessity, and that they or their families are between 3 and twenty-two years of age and not high school graduates or have obtained their GED. These interviews by the recruiters are conducted in person, face-to-face. At that point the recruiter will complete a certificate of eligibility if the family/individual is eligible, obtaining the following information: name, address (current and prior), homebase address, present school district, children's names, sex, date of birth, age, place of birth, present grade, last school attended, (if still in school), their native language, their race code (observed), from what school/town/state they came from/to, where in New York State they arrived, their arrival date in New York State, if their children traveled with them joined them or on their own and on what dates, the name of the qualifying person they traveled with or to join, if they sought temporary or seasonal work in a qualifying activity and the specific activity they applied for or work at, their residency date in the current district, and their signature on the form. The recruiters have been trained to recognize all qualifying activities areas, such as but not limited to fruit and vegetable farms, dairy farms, nurseries, logging (the felling, trimming and skidding of trees/logs on site), food processing (vegetables, fruits, poultry, meat), apiaries, making sure to note specific activities done (e.g. picking and packing hydroponic tomatoes, etc.). Recruiters complete the COEs and send them to the ID/R office as well as a copy to the local MEOP (Migrant Education Outreach Program) as they are completed for the ID/R office to review and certify as eligible. Children who have been identified in a prior year and are still eligible and still reside in New York State must have their residency verified by one of 20 recruiters across New York State using sources such as the families themselves, local school personnel and regional MEOPS service records, by stamping a copy of the family's COE with a date still here, their signature, what source told them they were still here, and send that copy to the MEOP's and the Identification/Recruitment office as a validation copy. This process of verification begins each year in November and concludes the following November. The category 2 count was done on the MIS-2000 data system utilizing the following records; COEs --supplemental services records and summer enrollment/withdrawal dates/records. The State will determine the dates of enrollment for the summer program which cannot occur before the last day of the regular school year. For the 9/1/08-08/31/09 period the summer start date could be no earlier than 6/26/09 and no later than 8/31/09. Each of the 11 local Migrant Education Programs (MEOP) use a State approved and developed summer enrollment form which must contain the necessary state mandated instructional and support service codes for the summer period as required by the State Migrant Education Program. Each MEOP conducts an in-service to train their tutor/advocate on the correct completion of this form. When the tutor/advocate begins providing services they start documenting their activities on the student summer enrollment record forms. Forms are submitted throughout the summer period through early September. When the local MEOP data specialist receives the summer enrollment form he/she adds a new school history line for each migrant student receiving services. These enrollment lines are added as an "S" type of enrollment and have to contain the supplemental program services that were provided. If no supplemental services are listed for a "S" type of school history line, the migrant student will not count towards the category 2 count. No instructional bag drop off is counted as a supplemental service for the summer term. The summer enrollment forms are kept in hard copy at the local level.

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.

The local MEOPs (eleven) data entry specialists input all information related to regular year and summer services and upload this information to the state computer server located in the State ID/R & MIS-2000 office. The MIS-2000 coordinator monitors the MIS-2000

system weekly throughout the year. All data is checked for completeness and accuracy, and the MIS-2000 coordinator accesses all data inputted on MIS-2000 and compiles the information necessary to obtain the category 2 count. Local sites will notify the State MIS-2000 coordinator of possible duplicate students. The statewide coordinator will merge duplicate records which can only be merged on the state server by the coordinator. COE's completed on the MIS-2000 system are compared against COE's that arrive in the ID/R office by the MIS-2000 coordinator to insure both accurate data entry and that the COE's appear on the State server. The State server computer is responsible for producing the Category 1 and 2 counts. Additionally, local MEOP's receive reports listing eligible migrant children from the State server to compare against their local data counts. Data specialists then insure that eligible migrant children appear on the State lists.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 numbers were also collected using MIS-2000.

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.

Through programming, our system only allows specific qualifying arrival dates, valid age ranges (3-21) as well as a child's eligibility expiration dates. Every time a child is entered on the computer system, a program checks to make sure that the child's age or grade status is eligible to be counted. If not, the computer refuses further data entry by relaying that the information is out of the range of acceptability. This also happens with eligibility expiration dates, residency dates and Qualifying Arrival Dates. Another check to insure an accurate child count is late name/first name matching. When a new Certificate of Eligibility is reviewed for eligibility, that name is then entered as a query of similar last/first names is made to ascertain if the spelling could be different (e.g. Hernandez vs. Hernandes). This activity is even more intensely engaged in when a child has made a move from another residence in the State to the current residence in New York State. If there is a close match, the date of birth, parents' names and other data are compared. If the information still continues to match somewhat closely, the recruiter is asked to revisit and determine if the person is the same. If the two separate children are the same person their records are merged to create one unique student. This insures the accuracy of the Category 1 count along with the Category 2 count. Safeguards for valid qualifying activities are taken by the Identification and Recruitment coordinator and assistant coordinator on each and every Certificate of Eligibility received and inputted in New York State. They both individually review each COE for completeness and validity, returning those to the recruiter when not acceptable. Every child that is entered onto the MIS-2000 database is assigned a unique number. Every time a data entry specialist at any of the MEOP sites enters a child's name, they must do a query based on child's unique number, last and first name and date of birth. If a match is found, then a new number is not reated, thus ensuring only unique students are counted. If a match is not found, the child is assigned a unique number. Through programming, our system only allows specific Qualifying Arrival Dates, valid age ranges (ages 3-21) as well as child eligibility expiration dates. If a child graduates or receives their GED the expiration date is manually changed to the date of graduation or the day they receive their GED by the regional data entry specialist. This information is collected by the tutor/advocate. Every time a child's data are entered on MIS-2000, a program checks to make sure that the child's age and grade status is eligible to be counted. If not, the program refuses further data entry as out of the range of acceptability. This also happens with eligibility expiration dates, residency dates and Qualifying Arrival Dates. Safeguards for valid qualifying activities are taken by the Identification and Recruitment coordinator and assistant coordinator on each and every Certificate of Eligibility received and inputted in New York State. They both individually review each Certificate of Eligibility for completeness and validity, returning those deemed unacceptable to recruiters stating why those COE's were rejected.

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.

The category 2 numbers were also collected using MIS-2000.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Migrant Education Programs Identification and Recruitment Project is a separate and independent entity not related to local Migrant Education Outreach Programs. All recruiters in New York State are hired, trained, and monitored by the Identification and Recruitment Program not the local MEOP. This quality control measure insures objectivity and impartiality in this process. The New York State Identification and Recruitment Office reviews every COE completed in the State. If approved the date of approval is entered onto the MIS-2000 computer system. If not acceptable, it is returned to the recruiter to complete, update, correct or to invalidate. If not approved, the local site is notified not to provide service to the migrant children until further information is obtained by the ID/R office. If the COE is not approved after further investigation, no services will be provided and no enrollment lines will be entered into MIS-2000. The New York State Migrant Identification and Recruitment Program requires all newly identified migrant children/families census forms to have a parent/guardian signature. Exceptions are made, for example, for those individuals who are unable to write. This process helps assure that we receive the most accurate information possible on a child/family to determine eligibility. This combined with over 56 years of administrative identification and recruitment experience assures our MEP accuracy and efficiency in all Identification and Recruitment matters. The New York State Migrant Identification and Recruitment Office conducts one statewide and two regional trainings for recruiters. All new recruiters receive extensive Identification and Recruitment training by the Migrant Identification and Recruitment office staff and then are individually field trained by an experienced field recruiter for several weeks (2-4 weeks). The training consists of providing the Regulatory and Non-Regulatory Guidance to the new recruiter and explaining each. The Buckley Act of 1974 (privacy) is explained to them, mock ID/R interviews conducted and training done on how to fill out all documents related to eligibility (COEs, etc). Qualifying agricultural industries are described along with qualified activities deemed acceptable. The New York State ID/R training manual is reviewed and explained to new recruiters. All recruiters are regularly visited in the field by the identification/Recruitment staff (ID/R Coordinator, Associate ID/R Coordinator, Veteran Recruiters) for quality control and recruiter effectiveness. A dedicated migrant recruiter statewide toll free 800 number is available to all recruiters to ask eligibility questions from the field regarding the eligibility of newly located children. E-mail access is also available along with electronic reports which list migrant children by MEOP, county and school districts. The New York State Migrant Education ID/R Program continues its recruiter skills self evaluation during 2008/09 based on the CONQIR model; a test evaluating their knowledge of various eligibility areas (e.g. "to join" issues). Based on their answers, the ID/R Coordinator and Associate Coordinator modify their training content to address these perceived weaknesses.

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 New York State Migrant Education ID/R Program conducted a re-interview process during the summer of 2009 by creating and refining re-interview instruments followed by a rolling re-interview. On site face to face re-interviews were conducted on a random state wide sample of 50 certificate of eligibility (COE's). Based on the New York Migrant Identification/Recruitment Programs Office experience with the 2004 retrospective re-interview of migrant population, we knew a 300% over sample would be needed in order to obtain a 100% response rate, and therefore the 300% over sample was run prior to any re-interviews. In all cases the initial sample population was exhausted for interview purposes before the over sample populations were re-interviewed. Four trained re-interviewers conducted the interviews. The instrument used to re-interview families was developed by the 1308 ConQIR Grant. The "Re-Interview Questionnaire" was field tested by 8 states for accuracy. The interviewers were giving a day's training on conducting the re-interview using the "Re-interview Questionnaire". We assured that interviewers:

- Communicated with the families in their native language.

- Used a re-interview protocol that contains all data items used in making the original eligibility determination.

- Employed interviewers who had a strong background in migrant identification and recruitment.

- Used non threatening tactics to obtain information.

- Were well trained in regard to the re-interview questionnaire.

Were assigned geographical areas in the following manner: 70% of re-interviews completed by an out-of-state private contractor 15% completed by an in-state private contractor 15% completed by NYS migrant recruiters in areas they have not conducted recruitment activities in the past

The results of the study of the 54 families/individuals concluded that all were eligible for the Migrant Education Programs.

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.

In New York, two statewide staff members are responsible for the quality control and management of the student count. Two annual two-day statewide trainings are hosted for the 11 regional MIS-2000 data entry specialists. The following are some of the topics included in the trainings:

Proper school history enrollment by type (Academic, Summer, Residency Only);
Definition of supplemental services;
Needs assessment documentation/Priority of Service;
Possible duplicate student canned reports;
Reporting for academic and school year programs;
Designing Reports to eliminate data entry errors;
Health screen/Immunizations; and,
Testing information.

In addition, at least one on-site training per data entry specialist is conducted each year. Additional training is available upon request. The New York MIS-2000 director reviews each site individually to insure accuracy of information that is transferred to the New York State Server

which serves as the statewide database. A toll free number is also available to data entry specialists for technical assistance.

In the 2008/09 school year a State specific data entry manual was updated by the MIS-2000 director, 3 MEOP Directors, and 3 data entry specialists. This manual is now available on the New York State Migrant Programs web-site. This manual contains snapshots of different screens to visually provide proper enrollment techniques. This has been well received state wide. This manual is continuously changing to keep up with the ever changing needs of migrant children along with the new Migrant Student Information Exchange(MSIX) initiative.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One of the final processes to insure a unique student count in New York State is running reports which are generated using Soundex. Soundex reports compare similar names, and dates of birth. Other fields utilized to insure uniqueness are parents names, place of birth, current addresses and MEOP student service records. The ID/R director and the MIS-2000 director are the individuals responsible for comparing these reports. These records are merged insuring the child will only count once for the Category 1 & 2 counts. Once counts are completed they are shared and discussed with the NYS Migrant Program Manager and State Director for final approval and submission.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since no ineligibility cases were found as a result of New York States Migrant Education ID/R Programs prospective rolling re-interview initiative, no corrective actions were needed or taken.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Migrant Education program has no concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying determinations on which the counts are based.