

# 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**

**SOUTH CAROLINA**



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

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

### PART I

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

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

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

### PART II

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

### TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
South Carolina Department of Education

Address:  
1429 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Nancy W. Busbee, Ph.D.

Telephone: 803-734-8105

Fax: 803-734-3290

e-mail: nbusbee@ed.sc.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Jim Rex, Superintendent

Monday, April 19, 2010, 9:55:49 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

### STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

#### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

"No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

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.

South Carolina legislation, amended in June 2008, calls for a new assessment system for grades 3 -8. In response to this legislation, the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) was developed and administered for the first time in spring 2009. PASS includes five tests: writing, ELA (reading and research), mathematics, science, and social studies. The writing test is administered in March and the remaining tests are administered in May. The writing test includes an extended-response item and multiple-choice questions. In order to attain quicker scoring, the May tests contain multiple-choice questions only.

Achievement standards (cut scores) for PASS were set on October 5, 2009 by a separate state agency, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC). The previous test, PACT, reported four achievement levels (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced). The new legislation requires three achievement levels (Not Met, Met, and Exemplary).

The state submitted phase-one documentation for Peer Review in spring 2009 and will submit phase-two documentation (e.g., data) in February 2010 for Peer Review in March.

The SC-Alt is a selected-response assessment based on alternate achievement standards linked to grade-level academic standards. There are no changes planned for SC-Alt. SC-Alt is in process for approval and will submit final documentation in response for Peer Review in March 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.

"State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The PACT science test was administered for the last time in spring 2008. The state submitted the phase-one Peer Review materials for PACT science but after discussions with the USED, phase-two documentation (e.g. test results) was not sent because the PACT science test had already been administered for the last time.

The state submitted phase-one documentation for PASS science in spring 2009 and will send phase-two documentation for the March 2010 Peer Review.

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	371,349		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,338		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,628		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	141,755		>97%
Hispanic	18,688		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	202,306		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,141		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,645		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	201,667		>97%
Migratory students	136		>97%
Male	189,798		>97%
Female	181,551		>97%
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,447	35.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,522	59.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,643	5.3
Total	49,612	
<b>Comments: Due to a new assessment in South Carolina, this data is not available at this time. Data should be available during the next available period to update CSPR, Part I</b>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	371,438		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,338		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,629		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	141,788		>97%
Hispanic	18,692		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	202,357		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,166		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,647		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	201,718		>97%
Migratory students	136		>97%
Male	189,842		>97%
Female	181,596		>97%
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,015	36.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,977	58.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,652	5.3
Total	49,644	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	212,346		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	758		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,268		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	80,252		>97%
Hispanic	11,088		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	116,022		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	28,932		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,252		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	117,666		>97%
Migratory students	85		>97%
Male	109,182		>97%
Female	103,164		>97%
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

##### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# 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
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	55,273	41,792	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	166	77.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	970	855	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	21,157	13,070	61.8
Hispanic	3,301	2,304	69.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,344	25,156	85.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,162	3,843	47.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,328	2,330	70.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32,139	21,262	66.2
Migratory students	29	20	69.0
Male	28,160	20,906	74.2
Female	27,113	20,886	77.0
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

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

	# 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
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	55,178	48,051	87.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	179	83.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	942	872	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21,159	17,074	80.7
Hispanic	3,251	2,618	80.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,329	27,047	92.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,156	5,229	64.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,235	2,594	80.2
Economically disadvantaged students	32,077	26,196	81.7
Migratory students	28	21	75.0
Male	28,117	23,701	84.3
Female	27,061	24,350	90.0
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

##### 1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# 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
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	27,660	17,148	62.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	98	70	71.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	484	364	75.2
Black, non-Hispanic	10,601	4,774	45.0
Hispanic	1,647	897	54.5
White, non-Hispanic	14,697	10,948	74.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,133	1,533	37.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,644	870	52.9
Economically disadvantaged students	16,020	7,954	49.6
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	14,157	8,692	61.4
Female	13,503	8,456	62.6
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

#### 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

	# 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
<b>Grade 4</b>			
All students	53,735	44,869	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	173	85.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	877	826	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,119	14,725	73.2
Hispanic	2,898	2,347	81.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,370	26,555	90.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,541	4,043	53.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,972	2,432	81.8
Economically disadvantaged students	30,755	23,489	76.4
Migratory students	18	14	77.8
Male	27,523	22,805	82.9
Female	26,212	22,064	84.2
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	53,651	45,212	84.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	174	86.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	857	778	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,120	15,201	75.6
Hispanic	2,843	2,088	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	29,363	26,735	91.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,543	4,337	57.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,886	2,110	73.1
Economically disadvantaged students	30,701	23,817	77.6
Migratory students	18	12	66.7
Male	27,490	22,435	81.6
Female	26,161	22,777	87.1
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	53,663	36,847	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	153	75.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	877	733	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,088	10,227	50.9
Hispanic	2,895	1,774	61.3
White, non-Hispanic	29,333	23,755	81.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,477	2,976	39.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,970	1,817	61.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30,709	17,467	56.9
Migratory students	18	N<10	
Male	27,480	19,042	69.3
Female	26,183	17,805	68.0
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,974	43,242	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	163	84.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	770	715	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,041	14,088	70.3
Hispanic	2,821	2,231	79.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,896	25,830	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,424	3,632	48.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,692	2,115	78.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,954	22,157	74.0
Migratory students	27	23	85.2
Male	27,243	21,840	80.2
Female	25,731	21,402	83.2
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,894	46,612	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	177	91.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	750	712	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,045	16,304	81.3
Hispanic	2,769	2,302	83.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,888	26,894	93.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,428	4,502	60.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,604	2,125	81.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,906	24,769	82.8
Migratory students	27	18	66.7
Male	27,211	23,143	85.0
Female	25,683	23,469	91.4
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	26,412	18,080	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	86	66	76.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	385	322	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	10,013	5,067	50.6
Hispanic	1,451	856	59.0
White, non-Hispanic	14,346	11,679	81.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,704	1,392	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,379	802	58.2
Economically disadvantaged students	14,951	8,466	56.6
Migratory students	18	N<10	
Male	13,554	9,278	68.4
Female	12,858	8,802	68.5
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,185	40,478	77.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	139	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	784	727	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	19,889	13,048	65.6
Hispanic	2,586	1,903	73.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,536	24,501	85.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,753	2,658	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,431	1,797	73.9
Economically disadvantaged students	28,706	19,691	68.6
Migratory students	25	17	68.0
Male	26,947	19,985	74.2
Female	25,238	20,493	81.2
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,111	42,605	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	150	82.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	766	720	94.0
Black, non-Hispanic	19,881	14,317	72.0
Hispanic	2,545	1,950	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,534	25,299	88.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,753	3,133	46.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,360	1,782	75.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,669	21,141	73.7
Migratory students	25	13	52.0
Male	26,908	20,955	77.9
Female	25,203	21,650	85.9
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	26,051	16,750	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	91	55	60.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	381	319	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	9,869	4,520	45.8
Hispanic	1,287	734	57.0
White, non-Hispanic	14,324	11,055	77.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,402	984	28.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,202	676	56.2
Economically disadvantaged students	14,308	7,276	50.8
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	13,461	8,508	63.2
Female	12,590	8,242	65.5
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,923	40,760	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	141	82.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	756	697	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	19,407	12,973	66.8
Hispanic	2,490	1,869	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,887	24,912	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,693	2,639	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,121	1,545	72.8
Economically disadvantaged students	27,619	19,169	69.4
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	26,733	20,176	75.5
Female	25,190	20,584	81.7
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,846	39,905	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	170	133	78.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	737	663	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	19,405	12,582	64.8
Hispanic	2,434	1,718	70.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,892	24,647	85.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,700	2,511	37.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,035	1,345	66.1
Economically disadvantaged students	27,565	18,478	67.0
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	26,701	19,423	72.7
Female	25,145	20,482	81.5
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,809	36,904	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	168	121	72.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	754	648	85.9
Black, non-Hispanic	19,353	10,958	56.6
Hispanic	2,486	1,614	64.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,836	23,396	81.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,597	2,093	31.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,117	1,291	61.0
Economically disadvantaged students	27,541	16,367	59.4
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	26,643	18,429	69.2
Female	25,166	18,475	73.4
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,008	38,935	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	143	69.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	755	698	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	19,993	12,302	61.5
Hispanic	2,464	1,756	71.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,364	23,846	84.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,716	2,428	36.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,012	1,368	68.0
Economically disadvantaged students	27,327	17,676	64.7
Migratory students	11	10	90.9
Male	26,632	19,414	72.9
Female	25,376	19,521	76.9
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,923	40,263	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	144	70.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	740	664	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	19,984	13,325	66.7
Hispanic	2,415	1,724	71.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,358	24,211	85.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,710	2,540	37.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,936	1,262	65.2
Economically disadvantaged students	27,265	18,519	67.9
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	26,591	19,419	73.0
Female	25,332	20,844	82.3
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	25,913	16,313	63.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	108	67	62.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	377	319	84.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9,982	4,425	44.3
Hispanic	1,253	714	57.0
White, non-Hispanic	14,082	10,702	76.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,371	890	26.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,016	518	51.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,590	6,666	49.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	13,397	8,466	63.2
Female	12,516	7,847	62.7
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,754	45,254	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	142	88.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	701	668	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,452	16,274	79.6
Hispanic	2,050	1,754	85.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,220	26,260	93.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,323	3,178	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,258	999	79.4
Economically disadvantaged students	24,209	19,516	80.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	25,659	22,002	85.8
Female	26,095	23,252	89.1
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,788	46,279	89.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	141	87.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	696	644	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,489	17,129	83.6
Hispanic	2,029	1,682	82.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,245	26,529	93.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,354	3,468	54.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,225	884	72.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,247	20,174	83.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	25,689	22,181	86.3
Female	26,099	24,098	92.3
<b>Comments: Data has been verified.</b>			

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

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School**

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

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

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,119	562	50.2
Districts	86		
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	491	296	60.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	477	286	60.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	14	10	71.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
85		
<b>Comments: 86 School districts received Title I funding in the 08-09 school year. No districts made AYP based on the 2008-09 assessment data.</b>		

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

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

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

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	20
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	4
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	6
<b>Comments: Blanks represent zero.</b>	

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

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)	4
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	76
<b>Comments: Blanks represent zero.</b>	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools in restructuring implemented actions in five areas corresponding to the other category. First, instructional realignment was implemented with early dismissal bi-monthly for professional development enhancement opportunities, adopting early literacy and other literacy interventions was also indicated in schools, utilizing interdisciplinary units with collaborative on-site visits to the Center for Inquiry school were featured for one school, and hiring instructional coaches for ELA, math, and science were incorporated in schools. Second, data realignment was implemented with use of data-driven school based decision making through the broad use of computer based learning programs, benchmarks, and progress monitoring activities. Schools used a variety of data tools to enhance their assessment capacity. Third, district oversight processes were implemented to provide support, monitoring and intervention in the restructuring process. Some districts designated a specific district academic officer as the lead in the team process to oversee teacher, staff and principal review along with review of budgetary and improvement plans. Other districts incorporated a governing board, restructuring committee, academic cluster team, and a SCC, School Community for Change group. Fourth, elements of school reconstitution were implemented in schools through extension of the school year by twenty days, closing the school and opening as an AVID school, reconstituting into smaller learning academies, single gender classes and incorporating the TAP model of team clusters. Finally, staffing realignment was implemented in schools through replacement of school staff and/or administrators and through development of a school leadership team working along with district leadership in directing school efforts in planning, training, monitoring, and budgeting of the restructuring process. The sixty four schools in South Carolina utilizing the other category of restructuring have implemented a wide range of strategies toward accomplishing an alternate governance arrangement.

## 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<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Twenty-two school districts in South Carolina are identified in the improvement stage of Corrective Action. The state required the districts to conduct a self-evaluative needs assessment process by performing and submitting an academic review that included examining its data, programs and personnel in order to assist the state in determining the most appropriate option for corrective action. A variety of options were selected for implementation including deferring programmatic funds for curriculum support, extended day academic assistance, targeted reading approaches and district oversight actions. Another option was the replacement of relevant personnel. The diversity of corrective actions created challenges and opportunities for the state to offer targeted technical assistance. District contacts were utilized to maintain communication and collaboration with the state throughout the corrective action implementation process. Input was sought by the state to plan for technical assistance and support aligned to the district needs assessment and designated Corrective Actions. Technical assistance and support was provided with the assistance of the regional comprehensive center, the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). A two-day leadership training on the Professional Teaching and Learning Cycle (PTLC) was provided for district and school teams in the fall of 2008 with a follow up session in the summer of 2009. Support for the districts in Corrective Action was networked through the district contact, state education representatives and the regional comprehensive center state representative and consultants.

#### 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	9
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	12
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	01/22/10
---	----------

### 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	68,090	56,391
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	47,908	19,633
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	70.4	34.8
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	67,992	56,391
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	51,921	21,422
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	76.4	38.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	126
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	2
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	135
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		1	0	1	A	
2		32	1	8	A	
3		0	0	0		
4		3	0	0	B	
5		21	2	8	D	Extended Learning
6 = Combo 1	1,2,3	5	0	2	B	
7 = Combo 2	1,2,3,4	24	2	9	B	
8 = Combo 3	1,2,3,4,5	32	4	13	D	Improved Teaching

Comments: Had more combinations used than available space. In order of entry: 9 -1,2,4 -25  
-6 -10 -A 10 -1,2 -30 -4 -15 -A 11 -1,4 -2 -0 -0 -D 12 -1,2,4,5 -7 -0 -4 -A 13 -2,5 -18 -1 -5 -A 14 -2,4  
-7 -1 -1 -A 15 -1,4,5 -1 -0 -1 -A 16 -2,3,4,5 -1 -0 -0 -B 17 -1,3 -1 -0 -0 -A 18 -1,2,5 -7 -0 -4 -A 19  
-1,2,3,5 -4 -0 -2 -A 20 -1,3,4 -13 -0 -0 -A 21 -1,5 -2 -0 -1 -A 22 -2,3,5 -1 -0 -0 -A

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.

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.

For the 41 schools in the SIF project, information about effective practices in schools is shared and participating SIF schools schedule visits and observe these practices in action. As the SIF project coordinator provides technical assistance to each school and notes best practices in order to share this information with all other schools.

The new schools in their first year of SIF (24 schools) are involved a school level partnership with other schools to share information, professional development, and technical assistance. These partnerships were chosen from one of three categories: (1) mentoring schools, (2) grade level schools, and (3) feeder schools. The number of schools in each category is as follows: (1) 6, (2) 7, and (3) 11.

SIF schools participated in a technical assistance institute entitled Raising the Bar: Student Achievement and Identifying and Implementing Research-Proven Programs. Our presenters are from the Johns Hopkins Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education (CDDRE). They carry the research, development, and dissemination of state, district, school, and classroom strategies that use data on student performance to direct reform efforts. The focus of CDDRE is low-achieving elementary and middle schools, especially those failing to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) goals under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). CDDRE seeks to substantially expand the knowledge about district organization and management strategies, intended to enable district leaders to identify and then fill gaps in student performance in all schools whose students are struggling to meet those performance standards.

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.

State level funds are used to evaluate and monitor the progress of funded applicants. To propel school turnaround , the SCDE is actively involved in developing and delivering comprehensive leadership and technical assistance. The SCDE uses the SEA-retained funds to:

- provide oversight of fund allocation and program management for subgrantees
- monitor school improvement efforts
- coordinate and provide consulting and professional development to subgrantee schools and districts through in-house and an external service providers
- verify fidelity of implementation at site level
- evaluate (through evaluator) the effectiveness of program implementation
- contract with external service providers to provide onsite assistance
- support/offset administrative, training, and technical assistance costs.

A project coordinator spends significant time in each school providing technical assistance and professional development. The project coordinator also attends professional development related to skills needed in this area.

In addition, an external evaluator will use part of the retained state-level funds to evaluate and monitor the progress of funded applicants. At present, the examination of data, implementation rubrics and protocols, onsite visits, classroom observations, and quarterly reports are used to monitor quality and progress.

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.

Actions taken by the states funded by other entities and offices include training in the Professional Teaching and Learning Cycle offered to leadership team members from Districts in Corrective Action through consultancy with our comprehensive center, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Office of Federal and State Accountability associates and team leaders have attended conferences in relevant NCLB improvement efforts sponsored by the Southeast Comprehensive Center as part of SEDL's ongoing collaboration to build state capacity in working with districts and school in areas of need. The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement provided a webinar and a workshop to schools in the Restructuring stages to assist with the development and implementation of an alternate governance plan. The Center for Data Driven Reform in Education provided training in analyzing improvement efforts for participating schools in all stages of improvement. Next, external consultants were utilized in reviewing improvement plans and making recommendations for revisions. External consultants also provided onsite assistance to Title I schools in the Planning to Restructure stage through the development of Focused School Renewal Plans and assisting with planning processes for restructuring. Intra agency collaboration was presented through training that was offered to all Title I Coordinators by the state facilitator of the Response to Intervention process at the Title I convention

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	109,057
Applied to transfer	2,680
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,143

##### 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	\$ 3,330,808

##### 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	19

## FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

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

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

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	72,697
Applied for supplemental educational services	15,194
Received supplemental educational services	10,688
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 14,336,672
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	218,464	212,141	97.1	6,323	2.9
All elementary classes	131,144	128,939	98.3	2,205	1.7
All secondary classes	87,320	83,202	95.3	4,118	4.7

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

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

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

South Carolina uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

## FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	37.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

HQ special education teachers who are instructing students with disabilities out of area, such as HQ LD teaching EMD or HQ elementary teachers who are teaching special subjects, such as Spanish, art, or music to elementary students.

	Percentage
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	34.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	28.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	38.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 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	25,657	24,753	96.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	41,485	41,023	98.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	15,863	14,383	90.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	29,616	28,851	97.4

**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	91.7	62.7
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or eligible for Medicaid.	
Secondary schools	83.1	53.7
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or eligible for Medicaid.	

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

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

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	31,247
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	30,081
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	24,539
Russian	937
Vietnamese	650
Chinese	462
Arabic	382

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	31,273
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	758
Total	32,031
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3,336
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	10.7
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	30,972
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	740
Total	31,712
<b>Comments:</b>	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	8,514

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	9,251	36.0	4,491	20.00
ELP attainment	3,312	12.9	1,549	0.05
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments: With approximately 3-5 percent of the state's school population comprised of limited English proficient students and 50 different languages spoken, it is not practicable for South Carolina to develop native language assessments.</b>	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments: With approximately 3-5 percent of the state's school population comprised of limited English proficient students and 50 different languages spoken, it is not practicable for South Carolina to develop native language assessments.</b>

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

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



### 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
65	414	479
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
477	410	86.0	67
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

#### Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
477	405	84.9	72
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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
194	163	84.0	31
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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	44
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	35
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	44
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	44
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	35
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	3
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	7
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	1
<b>Comments: Three LEAs are in year three of district improvement and two are in the first year of improvement.</b>	

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

#### Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
5,321	849	1

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

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

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	521
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	100

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	64	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	61	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	53	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	49	
Other (Explain in comment box)	24	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	60	16,132
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	60	1,222
PD provided to principals	56	713
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	983
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	48	2,861
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	776
Total	296	22,687

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The subgrantees reported here also include consortia members, which is why this number appears larger than the total Title III subgrantees.

Other PD was conducted as follows: SC Response to Intervention for ELLs; Special Education/ESOL procedures; differentiating for content, language proficiency, and product; small group literacy instruction for ELLs; cultural diversity of ELLs; technology for ELLs and ESOL teachers; implementing the Inclusion model; identifying learning disabilities in ELLs; parent involvement strategies.

## 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
7/10/08	10/20/08	102
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

The above date was the date by which the fastest LEAs returned their final budget reports and signed grant awards from their superintendent to the SEA after the SEA made the final allocation amounts available to all LEAs. Other LEAs submitted their budget items to the SCDE at various rates, some slower than others, and these were then processed as quickly as possible by the SEA. Please note that there are several other offices involved in processing the grant awards to LEAs including the General Counsel, Finance and the Superintendent's office, all of which must take action before Title III money is actually available for LEAs to expend.

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments: There are no schools deemed "persistently dangerous". South Carolina has requested guidance through EdFacts partner support regarding File Spec NX130 and therefore, this has not been submitted at this time. This data will be updated through the available time to update CSPR, Part I.</b>	

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	46.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	70.4
Hispanic	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	79.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	46.1
Limited English proficient	61.7
Economically disadvantaged	66.6
Migratory students	80.0
Male	70.7
Female	79.8
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4.3
Hispanic	5.3
White, non-Hispanic	3.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.6
Limited English proficient	1.6
Economically disadvantaged	4.7
Migratory students	5.8
Male	4.4
Female	3.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

### FAQ on dropout rates:

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

## 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	70	70
LEAs with subgrants	16	16
Total	86	86
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	121	347
K	283	517
1	321	584
2	275	601
3	250	565
4	218	541
5	239	480
6	256	369
7	258	340
8	223	350
9	277	327
10	162	216
11	132	148
12	164	174
Ungraded		N<10
Total	3,179	5,565
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	294	1,100
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,229	3,250
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	198	814
Hotels/Motels	458	401
Total	3,179	5,565
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

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

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	265
K	489
1	519
2	529
3	520
4	498
5	475
6	360
7	347
8	330
9	372
10	213
11	145
12	169
Ungraded	
Total	5,231
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	181
Migratory children/youth	48
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	586
Limited English proficient students	156
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	15
Expedited evaluations	10
Staff professional development and awareness	15
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	0
Transportation	15
Early childhood programs	11
Assistance with participation in school programs	14
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	15
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	13
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	14
Coordination between schools and agencies	0
Counseling	14
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	16
School supplies	16
Referral to other programs and services	0
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	14
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other-Field Trips

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	8
School Selection	6
Transportation	8
School records	7
Immunizations	8
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		
<p><b>Comments: Grade #Taking Read Assess # Proficient or Better 3 302 223 4 352 219 5 372 246 6 255 127 7 242 122 8 242 119 HS 133 84</b></p>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		
<p><b>Comments: Grade #Taking Math Assess # Proficient or Better 3 391 167 4 352 227 5 371 217 6 256 120 7 241 122 8 234 90 HS 133 70</b></p>		

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

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	169
K	65
1	70
2	43
3	38
4	31
5	16
6	22
7	22
8	10
9	12
10	12
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	540
Total	1,057
<b>Comments: There were zero ungraded.</b>	

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

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 07-08 Category 1 Count was 960. The 08-09 Category 1 count is 1,057. The increase in the Category I Count is owing to a greater number of OSY identified. Several initiatives contributed to this increase. Participation in the OSY Consortium provided direction and support for program effort to identify and serve more OSY present during field preparation and the high crop season. Consortium funds provided opportunity for grant awards to two pilot programs in districts to identify and serve OSY and supported two temporary recruiters at the state level.

### 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)	68
K	58
1	49
2	31
3	37
4	29
5	13
6	12
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	322
Total	634
<b>Comments: There were 0 Ungraded students.</b>	

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

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 07-08 Category 2 Count was 543. The 08-09 Category 2 Count is 634. The increase in the Category 2 count is owing to similar factors as for the increase in Category 1 for this reporting year.

Participation in the OSY Consortium provided direction and support for program effort to identify and serve more OSY present during field preparation and the high crop season. Consortium funds provided opportunity for grant awards to two pilot programs to identify and serve OSY in districts and supported two temporary recruiters at the state level. The two pilot programs provided instructional and support services to OSY, with emphasis on survival English. The two temporary recruiters at the state level also scheduled and provided instructional lessons to OSY in camp areas, in addition to regular ID&R activity.

### 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.

To ensure accuracy and eliminate duplication in the child count process, the MIS2000 electronic data system for both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts is used for migrant program data management. The data were input from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) required by the South Carolina migrant program. The current South Carolina COE is compliant with the National COE and has been reviewed by the Office of Migrant Education, USED. The data review process at the state level was ongoing throughout the reporting year, with thorough review of data presented on each hard copy, original, completed COE. The manual count with review of COE data served to verify the accuracy of the information put into the MIS2000 system by participating electronic sites and the state site. MIS2000 will continue in use for the next reporting year. Accuracy of data input for each COE will continue to be verified with an additional manual count and review of data for all COEs presented from all sources.

Last year's child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 were generated by MIS2000 data system use, with a manual count and review of data for each COE presented from all sources.

The state will continue to use the same systems (electronic and manual) to generate the 2009-2010 Child Count. The MIS2000 data system will continue in use. A manual count with review of data for each COE presented from all sources will be performed at the state level.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data that serves to verify the Category 1 and Category 2 counts were collected using the same procedures for the time period of 9/1/08-8/31/09. Migrant recruiters and school districts enrolling migrant students completed a COE documenting the student's name, gender, ethnicity, date and place of birth with verification, and name of parent or guardian. Additionally, the COE requires listing qualifying move and activity, qualifying arrival date and previous residence, along with information from any prior school enrollment. For this year now concluded, the COE provided line space for supporting information for temporary or seasonal work. The COE requires the address of residence within the specified school district, the date of enrollment in school and program in which the student participated. Schools in participating districts for summer programs provided data through completed COEs, MIS2000 data entry and school district enrollment data reports. Additionally, COE data were completed and input for all out-of-school youth (OSY) identified and those identified and served through state recruiters, local summer programs and two OSY pilot programs.

The identification and recruitment of migrant families, their children and OSY generated the data collected for this child count. The identification and recruitment process was ongoing throughout this child count period. District summer program recruiters were trained in ID&R procedures by the state. Two additional state recruiters were employed and trained for the summer crop season to assist the state migrant recruiter. Migrant recruiters visited migrant camps and quarters, local tiendas and migrant health service centers, contacted and visited schools, conferred with district migrant recruiters and used referrals from multiple state and community sources. The other referral and information sources may include all other school district programs such as adult education, and other grant programs such as Migrant Head Start, South Carolina Migrant Health Program, outreach organizations, communities of faith, crew chiefs, other migrant workers and educational referrals from the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT). Data collection, input, and review were ongoing during the period of 9/1/08-8/31/09.

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 data were collected from the completed individual COE. Data generated from each completed COE were input into the MIS2000 system by six program sites and the state site. This data then became part of the state data collection within the MIS2000 system. The original hard copy COE was forwarded to the state for the data review and manual count that all COEs are given. The original hard copy COE data were individually reviewed and matched to the uploaded data to ensure accuracy. The state migrant recruiters, school districts and an OSY pilot program not having an MIS2000 site submitted all original, hard copy COEs to the state office for manual count, data review and input into the MIS2000 system. Each COE is coded in the system for type of service that determines child count category assignment and is reviewed for positive identification of eligibility and accuracy of service. Update of eligible migrant information for a COE or in MIS2000 is done on an individual basis. South Carolina does not use mass enrollment or mass withdrawal.

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.

Both Category1 and Category 2 Counts are made with the same procedures as described.

### 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.

All electronic and original, hard copy COE data were required to be provided to the state migrant education office. COE hard copy data not previously input and uploaded by participating program sites were input into the MIS2000 state database by state staff. The COE student data were organized by school district for regular school year enrollment or migrant summer program enrollment, then by grade. From this data input, lists of participants with pertinent, qualifying information were generated. The resultant data count for summer program service was checked against school district summer program enrollment and data reports. The OSY that were identified as eligible and received service were input with the local school district of residency. Other OSY identified throughout the state and those OSY provided certain services are reported through the state site.

The MIS2000 consolidated database was used for the student information system for child count purposes at the state level. In addition, a manual file system of original, hard copy COEs was maintained, organized by school district.

All COEs and participating districts' enrollment data were reviewed during October and November of 2009. Electronic data entered for all district program sites were examined for accuracy by review of supporting data on the COE's and school district enrollment data. Queries and reports were run on the MIS2000 system at the state level to ensure accuracy of data entered for the six program sites, pilot projects and additional OSY identified. Queries were run to filter out any student not meeting the required criteria of 3-21 years of age, within three years of a last qualifying move or resident at least one day for a qualifying activity. To prevent duplication, reports were run that identify students who have matching date of birth and last or first name. Duplicate student information was printed and reviewed, then the data were combined so that students were counted only once within the A-1 and A-2 child counts. To verify accuracy of information provided, participating school districts provided original, hard copies of COEs. These were checked for completion, accuracy, duplication, qualifying activity, qualifying arrival date, residency within three years of a qualifying move, district residency, age eligibility (between 3-21 years of age), and any summer participation. Therefore, through these procedures, confirmation activity to ensure accuracy in the child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 was performed.

Only those migrant students and OSY fully documented as eligible, during the twelve-month period of September 1, 2008 to August 31, 2009, were included in the 2008-2009 Child Count. Since the MIS 2000 system was implemented in the fall of 2000, manual checks and direct review of all information were implemented annually to verify the accuracy of the data presented. Both original and electronic copies of COEs were thoroughly reviewed and checked.

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 Count is generated from the same procedures and software as Category 1.

### 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.

Training sessions were held throughout the year to assist district program directors, district recruiters and the state recruiters. Eligibility requirements were provided in written guidance to all involved in the recruiting process. Law, regulations and overall issues related to eligibility of migrant children, continued to be strongly addressed in state training. New district recruiters received training and support immediately upon notice to the state of district recruiter employment. Ongoing software support to school district sites was provided this year by MIS2000 support personnel, with technical support and a training workshop provided by the state office for new data entry personnel at participating sites. An annual training is held by the state for all district migrant program personnel prior to the summer program.

To ensure that each child in the child count was eligible for inclusion, the use of a standard COE is required statewide. In addition to

available training and direct school district support, the state provided eligibility information and the required COE form on the Migrant Program Web page within the South Carolina Department of Education Web site. This ensured public availability of necessary information and documents. District personnel, district migrant recruiters or the state migrant recruiter conducted a personal interview with OSY or the responsible party for each child identified. Signatures were required for the interviewer, the parent or guardian, and the person certifying the eligibility of the child(ren). All hard copy COEs were reviewed by the state's migrant recruiter for accuracy in determining eligibility.

Questioned eligibility was referred to the state level for final determination of eligibility. Site visits and monitoring of district programs provided further opportunity to review COE data or resolve eligibility questions.

The annual re-interview process assisted in verification for accuracy of information received and entered on the COEs. Re-interviewing activity to assess COE information data for newly identified migrant children was performed by the state migrant recruiters. A random sample was determined for the re-interviewing activity.

The COEs were checked against the enrollment lists provided by the districts. COEs from other sources were reviewed, then input at the state site. Checks for duplication were ongoing. An additional step to eliminate duplicates was the review of certain data elements. Children with the same or similar names were verified by comparing all data elements. Only eligible students and youths for the 2008-2009 reporting period were entered into the MIS2000 database for this child count period.

A review team in the state office ensured that duplications and students no longer eligible were eliminated from the database. Any COE that was incomplete or showed error was returned to the school district immediately for clarification. If clarification or necessary information could not be provided, that COE was omitted from the child count report data and was maintained separately. Any COE resulting from duplication or ineligibility of the student was archived in a separate manual file for any necessary reference. Summer program participants received immediate review of COE data such that only eligible children were served.

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 quality control re-interview process for this year was based on the Rolling Re-interview. The re-interview was to be performed before the identified children were enrolled in the summer program, and before any COE data were input into MIS2000. For small states with less than 1,000, it was recommended to re-interview at least 10% of those identified. This process was used for small state South Carolina. Additionally, several initial COE's completed by new recruiters were reviewed and re-interviewed to ensure that new recruiters were conducting interviews properly.

#### Rolling Re-Interview (Quality Control) School Year 2008-09

South Carolina's quality control process for this year was based on the Rolling Re-Interview model. The 141 children were randomly selected throughout the state. Each of the summer program sites was visited by state migrant recruiters for the re-interview process. COEs from districts without a program were compiled as one district, using the same re-interview process.

The goal of the re-interview process was to re-interview the original person identified as having been interviewed on the completed COE. The re-interview was structured not to simply verify information on the COE but to conduct a second interview, then compare the results. If discrepancies were found, effort was made to determine the actual facts at re-interview rather than visiting the family a third time. An additional goal was to conduct the re-interviews face to face with the person who signed the COE within the original interview. If the person wasn't available, contact by phone was attempted before the alternate was used.

All districts with summer program participated in Re-interview process. State recruiters visited LEAs and followed the process of random selection. COEs were shuffled and then every 10th child was selected to be re-interviewed (counting 10, 20, 30, 40, 3tc). Additionally, every 10th child was selected as alternate (counting 5, 15, 25, 35, etc).

With increased focus on quality control and training, only one district had discrepancy. The two children in the one district that were found

Approximately 10% of all identified children were re-interviewed.

#### 08-09 Re-Interview Results

District #	Sampled #	Re-interviewed #	OK #	DNQ	Confidence Level
Aiken	10	9	9		-100%
Beaufort	29	23	23		-100%
Charleston	20	19	19		-100%

Clarendon 3 6 3 3 -100%  
Colleton 31 9 9 -100%  
Spartanburg 2 18 6 4 2 66%  
others 27 27 27 -100%  
Totals 141 96 94 2 97.91%

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.

South Carolina does not merge data. All original COEs were provided to the state office. Each COE was reviewed for completion and accuracy. When the data were input electronically and uploaded to the MIS2000 software, the COE data were compared for completion and accuracy of input at the state level, using the original COE as reference. All COEs supporting the reported data were either newly completed ones or updated ones, and were completed or updated as identification was made during this reporting year.

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.

All data information had comparison review of the original, hard copy COE data with that of electronic input. MIS2000 reports were run to eliminate duplicates by focusing on elements such as first name, last name, date of birth and varied spelling of names. Any possible duplicates have comparison information reviewed such as parent's name, place of birth, school history or other eligibility data. This is performed for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts. Duplicates found were removed within these ongoing reports run throughout the reporting year. All features of Potential Duplicate Students in the MIS2000 software were also utilized, but none were found within this process step, after all other reports were run throughout the year.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The purpose of the re-interviewing process for quality control has been strongly emphasized to all recruiters and district personnel.

Additional training and ongoing review for the critical elements of eligibility will continue to be the focus for improvement. The training in early spring for all district recruiters and follow up training for new district recruiters before the summer program begins is a central focus for the state ID&R training. Districts will again be strongly encouraged to employ the recruiter(s) earlier, so that state training and ongoing review may be accomplished more in advance of the season activity.

Districts were also strongly encouraged to use their access to the state student data base of the district to verify any regular year enrollment, as another check for residence and qualifying arrival dates.

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.

Human error continues to be an abiding concern relative to accuracy of information received by the recruiters in the identification and recruitment process.