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

VERMONT

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

	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:

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

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

Address:
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Kerry Garber

Telephone: 802-828-3150

Fax: 802-828-0573

e-mail: kerry.garber@state.vt.us

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

_____   __Friday, March 12, 2010, 4:49:17 PM__
          Signature   Date

Two sections are incomplete for this submission 1.4.8.1 and 1.10.3.3. These sections will be completed early next week and sent to the program contacts. there are comments in each section that indicate which portions are not yet done.

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.

When the final Common Standards are released, we will begin a process to review our standards and expectations and their alignment to the Common Standards as well as to 21st Century Skills and Knowledge and to adopt new standards. This process should occur between January-June 2010 with final State board adoption occurring in August 2010.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Vermont is currently working under a compliance agreement with USED to revise the alternate assessment of alternate achievement standards. We anticipate that the alternate assessment of alternate achievement standards will be fully revised and in compliance with USED peer review criteria by January 2011.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP)) science assessment is now fully operational and is administered in Vermont at grades 4, 8, and 11. It has been peer reviewed and approved by the US DOE. Revisions to the alternate assessment of alternate achievement standards (see above) include science.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	46,565		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	110		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	688		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	765		>97%
Hispanic	536		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	43,765		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,265		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	822		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	15,462		>97%
Migratory students	86	83	96.5
Male	23,863		>97%
Female	22,702		>97%

Comments: "American Indian or Alaska Native" math numbers are suppressed on section 1.3 in grades 3-8 because of small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" math numbers on section 1.3 includes only Asian students because of small numbers in the Pacific Islander subgroup. Pacific Islanders ARE included on section 1.2 because the data on participation were not suppressed. "Hispanic" math numbers are suppressed on section 1.3 in grade 3 because of small numbers. "Migratory" math numbers are suppressed on section 1.3 in grades 8 & 11 because of small numbers.

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	1,742	28.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,991	64.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	454	7.3
Total	6,187	
Comments:		

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	46,619		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	110		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	693	659	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	771	738	95.7
Hispanic	536		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	43,808		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,281		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	825	787	95.4
Economically disadvantaged students	15,503		>97%
Migratory students	86	83	96.5
Male	23,900		>97%
Female	22,719		>97%
Comments: "American Indian or Alaska Native" math numbers are suppressed on section 1.3 in grades 3-8 because of small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" math numbers on section 1.3 includes only Asian students because of small numbers in the Pacific Islander subgroup. Pacific Islanders ARE included on section 1.2 because the data on participation were not suppressed. "Hispanic" math numbers are suppressed on section 1.3 in grade 3 because of small numbers. "Migratory" math numbers are suppressed on section 1.3 in grades 8 & 11 because of small numbers.			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,805	29.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,958	63.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	456	7.3
Total	6,219	
Comments:		

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	21,302	20,366	95.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	64	84.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	332	302	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	374	346	92.5
Hispanic	228	216	94.7
White, non-Hispanic	20,000	19,164	95.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,125	2,851	91.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	359	331	92.2
Economically disadvantaged students	6,029		>97%
Migratory students	16		>97%
Male	10,897	10,391	95.4
Female	10,405	9,975	95.9
Comments: Because of limited verification of participation for Science, the information on which students have a valid exemption is not available.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,058	37.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,663	58.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	130	4.6
Total	2,851	
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,197	4,068	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	91	63	69.2
Black, non-Hispanic	105	40	38.1
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic	5,795	3,845	66.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	711	221	31.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	145	64	44.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,183	1,071	49.1
Migratory students	21	10	47.6
Male	3,217	2,139	66.5
Female	2,980	1,929	64.7
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" and "Hispanic" are suppressed for Grade 3 Math due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,191	4,404	71.1
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	88	66	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	101	47	46.5
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic	5,796	4,161	71.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	712	198	27.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	139	70	50.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,184	1,196	54.8
Migratory students	21	10	47.6
Male	3,217	2,172	67.5
Female	2,974	2,232	75.0
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" and "Hispanic" are suppressed for Grade 3 Reading due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,436	4,414	68.6
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	93	72	77.4
Black, non-Hispanic	128	51	39.8
Hispanic	69	39	56.5
White, non-Hispanic	6,016	4,177	69.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	782	229	29.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	156	75	48.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,559	1,362	53.2
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	3,321	2,273	68.4
Female	3,115	2,141	68.7
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 4 math due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,426	4,476	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	90	69	76.7
Black, non-Hispanic	119	66	55.5
Hispanic	69	39	56.5
White, non-Hispanic	6,018	4,227	70.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	781	213	27.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	151	71	47.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,551	1,403	55.0
Migratory students	14	N<10	42.9
Male	3,318	2,152	64.9
Female	3,108	2,324	74.8
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 4 reading due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,430	3,322	51.7
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	97	60	61.9
Black, non-Hispanic	129	34	26.4
Hispanic	71	23	32.4
White, non-Hispanic	5,995	3,148	52.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	936	184	19.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	148	31	21.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,340	789	33.7
Migratory students			
Male	3,325	1,693	50.9
Female	3,105	1,629	52.5
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" and "Migratory students" are suppressed for grade 4 science due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,509	4,424	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	97	72	74.2
Black, non-Hispanic	97	40	41.2
Hispanic	78	43	55.1
White, non-Hispanic	6,100	4,188	68.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	867	241	27.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	107	44	41.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,158	1,127	52.2
Migratory students	11	N<10	36.4
Male	3,318	2,260	68.1
Female	3,191	2,164	67.8
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 5 math due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,499	4,560	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	75	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	96	47	49.0
Hispanic	78	45	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	6,097	4,307	70.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	867	226	26.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102	42	41.2
Economically disadvantaged students	2,159	1,148	53.2
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	3,311	2,201	66.5
Female	3,188	2,359	74.0
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 5 reading due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not assessed at grade 5			

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,615	4,329	65.4
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	74	71.2
Black, non-Hispanic	114	42	36.8
Hispanic	76	40	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	6,198	4,099	66.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	973	241	24.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	124	44	35.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,125	1,022	48.1
Migratory students	16	N<10	
Male	3,395	2,233	65.8
Female	3,220	2,096	65.1
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 6 math due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppppressed due to small numbers.			

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,612	4,687	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	101	87	86.1
Black, non-Hispanic	112	60	53.6
Hispanic	76	51	67.1
White, non-Hispanic	6,202	4,412	71.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	978	255	26.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	119	54	45.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,126	1,143	53.8
Migratory students	16	N<10	
Male	3,396	2,207	65.0
Female	3,216	2,480	77.1
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 6 reading due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are supppressed due to small numbers.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not assessed at grade 6			

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,600	4,166	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	73	77.7
Black, non-Hispanic	112	38	33.9
Hispanic	85	45	52.9
White, non-Hispanic	6,183	3,940	63.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	934	187	20.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	99	30	30.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,089	921	44.1
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	3,410	2,146	62.9
Female	3,190	2,020	63.3
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 7 math due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,588	4,979	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	92	79	85.9
Black, non-Hispanic	109	59	54.1
Hispanic	84	61	72.6
White, non-Hispanic	6,178	4,698	76.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	935	251	26.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	96	44	45.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,086	1,244	59.6
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	3,406	2,423	71.1
Female	3,182	2,556	80.3
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" are suppressed for grade 7 reading due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppressed due to small numbers.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not assessed at grade 7			

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,838	4,274	62.5
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	86	71	82.6
Black, non-Hispanic	123	52	42.3
Hispanic	82	43	52.4
White, non-Hispanic	6,430	4,053	63.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,006	168	16.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	113	47	41.6
Economically disadvantaged students	2,370	1,025	43.2
Migratory students			
Male	3,487	2,139	61.3
Female	3,351	2,135	63.7
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" and "Migratory students" are suppressed for grade 8 math due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are supppressed due to small numbers.			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,835	4,711	68.9
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	81	71	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	120	68	56.7
Hispanic	82	56	68.3
White, non-Hispanic	6,436	4,454	69.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,010	201	19.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	111	49	44.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,369	1,234	52.1
Migratory students			
Male	3,486	2,221	63.7
Female	3,349	2,490	74.4
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" and "Migratory students" are suppressed for grade 8 reading due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are supppressed due to small numbers.			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,865	1,687	24.6
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	91	37	40.7
Black, non-Hispanic	125	11	8.8
Hispanic	83	13	15.7
White, non-Hispanic	6,441	1,606	24.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,035	46	4.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	106	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	2,103	215	10.2
Migratory students			
Male	3,498	900	25.7
Female	3,367	787	23.4
Comments: Data for "American Indian or Alaska Native" and "Migratory students" are suppressed for grade 8 science due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppppressed due to small numbers.			

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	7,196	2,525	35.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	43	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	72	31	43.1
Black, non-Hispanic	79	10	12.7
Hispanic	63	15	23.8
White, non-Hispanic	6,888	2,447	35.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	914	53	5.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	68	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	1,898	356	18.8
Migratory students			
Male	3,610	1,301	36.0
Female	3,586	1,224	34.1
Comments: Data for "Migratory students" are suppressed for high school math due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppppressed due to small numbers.			

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	7,227	5,182	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	43	23	53.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	70	46	65.7
Black, non-Hispanic	81	48	59.3
Hispanic	64	42	65.6
White, non-Hispanic	6,919	4,994	72.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	936	220	23.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	69	18	26.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1,920	1,064	55.4
Migratory students			
Male	3,635	2,361	65.0
Female	3,592	2,821	78.5
Comments: Data for "Migratory students" are suppressed for high school reading due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppppressed due to small numbers.			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,071	1,902	26.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	93	22	23.7
Black, non-Hispanic	92	11	12.0
Hispanic	62	N<10	
White, non-Hispanic	6,728	1,845	27.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	880	46	5.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	77	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	1,586	193	12.2
Migratory students			
Male	3,568	934	26.2
Female	3,503	968	27.6
Comments: Data for "Migratory students" are suppressed for high school science due to small numbers. "Asian or Pacific Islander" numbers reflect only the "Asian" subgroup because "Pacific Islander" data are suppppressed due to small numbers.			

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.

	# 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	7,071	1,902	26.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	N<10	

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	307	218	71.0
Districts	238	174	73.1
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> 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	223	150	67.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	142	84	59.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	81	66	81.5
Comments: 150 Title I schools made AYP in 2009, up from 133 the previous year.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
166	111	66.9
Comments: Should be 185 districts receiving, 129 made AYP, or 69.7%		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	5
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	4
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: There were no Restructuring Schools in the 2008-2009 school year.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because of the definition of district for accountability purposes as the town or union school district, in the majority of cases, the identified district is the same as the identified school, so we work through the identified school consequences.

 For those districts with multiple school buildings, we have two types of identified districts: those that have identified schools and those that do not. In those that have identified schools (14) we focus our work on the schools but work with the district for populations not identified at the school level. We provide technical assistance directly to the schools to help them effectively carry out the specific required actions in place depending on their level of identification. We also work with district leadership to assure they are addressing the needs of any identified subgroups in schools within the district that are not identified but whose performance contributed to the identification of the district.

To meet the Required Actions schools must develop a system of progress monitoring to assure that students who are struggling are identified early and provided appropriate support. The impact of the supports must also be assessed and adjusted as needed. Principals are required to participate in a monthly principal learning community. Schools at the restructuring level must participate in a 3 day data retreat to inform the development of their restructuring plan. In addition, the entire faculty in these schools must participate in monthly professional learning communities that are guided by a trained facilitator and focused on review of student work and instruction.

For districts that do not have identified schools (9), we work with the district leadership to assure that they are working with schools through the development and implementation of school improvement plans to address the content areas and subgroups that caused the district to be identified.

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	5
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	05/01/09

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	1,305	8,748
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	765	4,815
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	58.6	55.0
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	1,182	8,738
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	755	5,449
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	63.9	62.4
Comments: 2008-2009 data are incorrect because of small n file suppression for the EDEN files. The correct data are: Math Tested: 8519 Math Proficient: 5068 Math Percentage: 59.5% Reading Tested: 8497 Reading Proficient: 5670 Reading Percentage: 66.7%		

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	1
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	0
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	29
Comments:	

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	**Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.**	**Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status**	**Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)**	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.**
6 = Combo 1	2, 5A, 5B	21	0	1	D	As a result of progress monitoring classroom teachers more closely monitor student progress, are able to intervene in a more timely manner, and alter intervention if the data do not indicate improvement.
7 = Combo 2	1, 2, 5A, 5B	7	0	0	D	As a result of progress monitoring classroom teachers more closely monitor student progress, are able to intervene in a more timely manner, and alter intervention if the data do not indicate improvement.

Comments: 5A:Develop a Progress Monitoring System a) use multiple measures to track student progress. Staff reviews the data from these measures frequently. b) As a result of the analysis of the data, actions will be taken to address the issues presented: provide specific academic supports needed for all students who perform below expectations on those measures being tracked. -Refer students to the appropriate services and supports. -Monitor student participation in those supports and their effects on student outcomes. -Provide evidence of steps taken to address needs identified by the data. 5B:Principal will attend a Principal Learning Community (PLC) made up of other principals in the region on a monthly basis. These PLCs will provide a venue for principals to talk to each other about strategies and challenges related to student achievement, specifically: -Implementation of the Commissioner's Required Actions Addressing achievement gaps (Free and Reduced Lunch, Students with Disabilities) that caused AYP identification -Implementation of federal requirements such as Supplemental Educational Services Accountability determinations based on fall 2008 assessments are not available as of 12/21/2009.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We share effective strategies in a variety of ways:
-large group meetings with all identified schools,
-school support coordinators direct work with schools
-monthly principal learning communities,
-special training opportunities such as the Formative Assessment Project and the Data -Retreat, Vermont Professional Development network (VPDN)
-Resource development with identified schools (e.g. Item banks)
-online via our department web site and Learning Village (instructional resources)
-newsletters

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.

In 2008-2009 we were completing work with identified high schools on an item bank for math and reading at grades 8 and 10. Late in the 2008-2009 school year, we expanded the project to grades 2-7 at the request of the identified schools. This work continues into the current school year.

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.

Our school support coordinators who work with all identified schools are partially supported by state funds. Through our partnership with the Vermont Student Assistance Program (VSAC) in a Gear-Up grant, we are able to provide some funding to non-Title I schools with middle or high school grades to implement schoolwide improvement strategies targeted at the reasons they were identified.

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	1,564
Applied to transfer	6
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	6

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 0

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	21

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	4,098
Applied for supplemental educational services	222
Received supplemental educational services	209
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 476,586
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	20,092	18,848	93.8	1,244	6.2
All elementary classes	4,650	4,429	95.2	221	4.8
All secondary classes	15,442	14,419	93.4	1,023	6.6

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	74.1
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	6.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	80.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	8.6
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	1,615	1,503	93.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,794	1,668	93.0
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,454	2,281	93.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	3,656	3,465	94.8

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	48.5	22.5
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Meals used for Poverty metric.	
Secondary schools	38.5	19.7
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Meals used for Poverty metric.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

    a.   *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.*

    b.   *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.*

    c.   *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All 8 LEAs/Consortia also reported using a "Self-Contained ESL Class" (focusing on language instruction) at the high school level and/or an "inclusionary" (push-in)language instruction educational program (ESL in the classroom).

Data reflect the 2008-2009 school year.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined underduplicated 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	1,636
Comments: Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.	

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

In the table below, provide the underduplicated 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.	1,198
Comments: Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.	

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
Bosnian	171
Cushitic (Other)	171
Spanish; Castilian	155
Vietnamese	148
Chinese	123

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Cushitic (Other) is Maay. Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.

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	1,634
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	N<10
Total	1,636
Comments: Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	426
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	26.2
Comments: Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.	

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	1,198
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Total	1,198
Comments: Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.	
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.	350

1.6.3.2.2
Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of ôMaking Progressö and the number and**
   percent that met the State definition of ôAttainmentö of English language proficiency.

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	431	39.1	429	50.00
ELP attainment	245	22.2	91	10.57

Comments: The data reported here is for SY 2008-2009. However, the auto calculation function for 1.6.3.2.2. is not accurately calculating the percentages in the results column, at least in the case of Vermont. It is currently undercounting the percentage of students who actually made progress and attained proficiency in Vermont, which potentially affects accountability and federal reporting on Vermont results. Specifically, the Percentage of students defined as making progress on the CSPR is "Making Progress"/("No Progress" + "Making Progress" + "Attain Proficiency"). This is double counting some students in the denominator. It would be correct in Vermont to have "Making Progress"/("No Progress" + "Making Progress"). The percentage of students defined as ELP attainment on the CSPR is "Attain Proficiency"/("No Progress" + "Making Progress" + "Attain Proficiency"). It would be correct in Vermont if the calculation were "Attain Proficiency"/("No Progress" + "Making Progress"). There were 431 (50.2%) students that made progress, and 245 (28.6%) students that reached attainment. Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Vermont does not offer any native language academic assessments

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Vermont does not offer any native language academic assessments

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Vermont does not offer any native language academic assessments

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
151	118	269
Comments: Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.		

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
138	95	68.8	43
Comments: Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students were assessed in Fall 2008 on content from the 2007-2008 School Year.			

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
138	118	85.5	20
Comments: Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students were assessed in Fall 2008 on content from the 2007-2008 School Year.			

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
38	14	36.8	24
Comments: Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students were assessed in Spring 2008 on content from the 2007-2008 School Year.			

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	11
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	8
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	11
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	10
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	9
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	2
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	1
Comments: 2008-2009 AMAO 1&2 Determinations are based on ELP data from the spring of 2008, 2008-2009 AMAO 3 are based on fall 2008 academic data. (The ELP and Academic data are both based on the same teaching year, 2007-2008).	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: State did not meet AMAO 3.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the underlined 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
631	315	2

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.

Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.

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.	79
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	30

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.

Data are for the 2008-2009 School Year.

* This number should be the total underline 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	8	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	8	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	8	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	4	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	8	385
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	8	57
PD provided to principals	8	22
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	8	36
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	8	37
PD provided to community based organization personnel	4	12
Total		549

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/1/08	10/1/08	90
Comments: The Vermont Title III Program's grant period is October 1 -September 30 rather than July 1 -July 30. There are several reasons that we chose to follow this schedule: 1. It allows us to use the results of the English language proficiency (ELP) assessments which arrive during the summer, providing the most up-to-date count of eligible LEP students by district; 2. LEAs have repeatedly said that they prefer submitting the Title III grant in the fall, when staff are back in school again and ready to plan and write the grants; 3. It allows LEAs to plan and implement summer program activities well in advance (which would be difficult to do on the July 1 -June 30 schedule) and provides enough funding to carry them into the first month of school (and tide them over until the next round of Title III funding becomes available).		

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 LEAs actually don't go 90 days without access to Title III funds. The majority of districts plan according to the October 1 -September 30 schedule and spread their use of Title III funds out over the year.

The best way to shorten the period of distribution of Title III funds would be:

* Hold Technical Assistance meeting with interested districts in advance to review the criteria for approval of a grant, resulting in less need for revisions and quicker processing in the fall (incomplete grants slow down the approval process.)

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: There are no persistently dangerous schools in Vermont	

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	85.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	79.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	78.7
Hispanic	80.2
White, non-Hispanic	85.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	66.6
Limited English proficient	75.6
Economically disadvantaged	72.9
Migratory students	66.7
Male	84.0
Female	87.2
Comments:	

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

Adjusted cohort graduation rate, including summer graduates, with no exclusions.

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	2.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.8
Hispanic	5.1
White, non-Hispanic	3.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.0
Limited English proficient	2.0
Economically disadvantaged	6.3
Migratory students	3.9
Male	3.7
Female	3.1
Comments: The Total number of migrant students has decreased over the year making the dropout rate decrease. There are also a greater number of out of school youth.	

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	57	57
LEAs with subgrants	4	4
Total	61	61
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23	N<10
K	41	14
1	53	19
2	51	15
3	47	15
4	37	N<10
5	46	N<10
6	25	N<10
7	36	N<10
8	33	11
9	28	N<10
10	28	N<10
11	28	N<10
12	50	N<10
Ungraded		
Total	526	136
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	40	40
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	305	56
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	47	N<10
Hotels/Motels	134	34
Total	526	136
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	31
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	16
10	29
11	26
12	36
Ungraded	40
Total	178
Comments: The correct total should be 225. Small N suppression used in the EDFACTS file.	

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	93
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	98
Limited English proficient students	
Comments: Limited English proficient student total is less than ll. Small N suppression used in the EDFACTS file.	

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	4
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	4
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	4
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	4
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	3
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	4
School supplies	4
Referral to other programs and services	4
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	2
School Selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations	1
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		
Comments: Reading Assessment data are collected directly from the programs that provide the services. In grades 3-8, there were 11 students assessed and two were proficient. At High School, there were 12 students assessed and 12 were proficient.		

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		
Comments: Mathematics Assessment data are collected directly from the programs that provide the services. In grades 3-8, there were 11 students assessed and two were proficient. At High School, there were 12 students assessed and 10 were proficient.		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	18
1	11
2	21
3	26
4	15
5	13
6	12
7	18
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	235
Total	396
Comments: Grade(s) -8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 -Null Cell = Suppressed Value Zero = Actual Value Total = 426 (Includes suppressed cell data)	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease is 8.6%.

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)	17
K	
1	
2	12
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	80
Total	109
Comments: Null Cell = Suppressed Value Grade(s) -K, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 Zero = Acutal Value Grades -10, 11, 12 and Ungraded Total = 164 (Includes suppressed cell data)	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> The decrease in the Catagory 2 Child Count is 10.4%. This is due to the continuing trend of hard fiscal times in the dairy industry. Dairy work is by far, Vermont number one qualifying activity. As milk prices continue to fall and costs of operation continue to rise, our dairy owners have hired less help and more have closed operations all together. We just have less students to work with during the summer months.

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.

> 1   Vermont uses MIS2000 to generate both Category 1 and 2 counts.
> 2   Yes, Vermont has used MIS2000 for several years.

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.

> 1   Two sets of data are collected and inputted into the database: information from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and information from the performance reports from locally funded projects (both regular and summer terms).
> 2   After a family with potentially eligible migrant students is identified,trained recruiters visit the family to determine their eligibility. A COE is completed and sent to the State's Identification & Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator for initial verification. The COEs are then given to the trained Data Specialist who compares the information to any past information on that family (including comparing student State ID number,student name,and both parents' names) or student. Data such as birth dates and place of birth are doubly checked to ensure that migrant students that have changed names are not counted twice. The final verification is done by the State Director of Migrant Education who signs every COE. The data is then entered into the MIS2000 database. Information on the COEs is updated continually through the year as teachers and recruiters complete "Change" forms. If needed, updated COEs are completed. In addition, local projects and recruiters receive monthly lists of eligible students. They are asked to check those lists for accuracy and then send in any changes to the Data Specialist. Each year in November/December, the MEP does a residency verification by cross-checking the MEP database with the State's demographic database. For every non-match (a student has left, switched schools, preschool students, and OSY not in the database,etc) a recruiter personally visits and completes an updated COE. The only exception is if we have already updated the COE within the preceding 30 days.
> 3   The data for this report was collected from 9/1/08 through 11/09 and covers the period 9/1/08 through 8/31/09. COEs are collected as completed throughout the year and performance reports are collected at the end of the regular term and again at the end of the summer term. Procedures for Category 1 and 2 counts are collected and maintained exactly the same.

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.

> All COEs and performance reports come in to one data specialist. The data is first reviewed for accuracy and completeness by both the ID&R Coordinator and by the Data Specialist and then again by the State Director of Migrant Education. The Data Specialist is the only one who inputs the data and in essence controls the database. The database is updated every time a student's situation changes -a move a change in grade leaving the state etc. Monthly reports are created and reviewed for accuracy at both the state and local level. Changes are made if needed.

The Child Count Report was designed according to OME's specifications by Management Services for Education Data in their MIS2000 system. Several test runs are done during the year to ensure that the Child Count information is accurately counting students.

The Migrant Education database is separate but connected to the State's Student Demographic System and to the State's Education Data Warehouse. The State is able to cross-check information on migrant students. This enables us to verify the accuracy of information. The MEP database is still the only one in the State that records students who are in the state for only a short time.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same procedure is used. The summer session enrollment for the State's Category 2 count is reported at the end of summer. Projects have up to 30 days after the end of the summer projects to submit in hard copy the summer student participation reports.
When submitted the State Director of Migrant Education approves the reports after clearing up any questions then the Data Specialist enters the information into the database.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who–in the case of Category 2–received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1   The Child Count is a report function of our MIS2000 system. It is designed to only count those students that are between 3 and 21 years of age and made a qualifying move within the past 3 years. 2   Students' towns of residency is a data field on the COE. Residency is annually verified by comparing the students in the Migrant Education database (MIS2000) with the State's Student Demographic database (which is updated each October). A report is generated that confirms residency for students that are enrolled in school in Vermont. Another list is generated for students whose residency cannot be verified by the matching process. For those students recruiters go out and personally verify residency and update the COE. We do not include students in the Count whose residency is not verified. Students are counted only if they resided in the State for at least one day during the period 9/1/08 through 8/30/09. 3   Each funded local project reports the summer/intercession services each student receives in the summer Performance Report. Each year the local projects receive training on the definition of summer/intercession services. From those reports the Data Specialist enters the summer/intercession services each student receives into the MIS2000 database and a summer count report is created. The program only counts those students who receive summer services and are between 3 and 22 and have not yet received their high school diploma. It does not include students on an extended status -those whose LQM was more than 3 years before the start of the summer program. 4   Because only the Data Specialist enters the data she is able to verify that students are only entered once per Child Count category. All students in Vermont are given a non duplicative identification number in both the MIS2000 and Student Demographic databases. Before an identification number is issued to a student a number of checks are performed -are there any similarities between names, birthdays, parents or other indicating factors. This is done to insure that the same child is not entered twice. MIS2000 is programmed to only count students with separate identification numbers.

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.

Category 2 count is generated using the same system.

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.

Accuracy checks are built into each step of the data process. The first step to guarantee accuracy is appropriate training for both recruiters and the Data Specialist. The State ID&R Coordinator trains all new recruiters and holds monthly meetings to talk about recruitment issues and to review eligibility criteria. All recruiters are trained using the training format suggested by recent updates to the migrant education guidance and that include materials developed by MERC. They all use a standard COE and checklist to ensure the accuracy of eligibility determinations. The Data Specialist often attends the recruiter meetings. Frequently the State Director of Migrant Education is asked to attend these meetings to clear up questions regarding eligibility. Quarterly, the State Director and the State Coordinator of ID&R meet to evaluate the effectiveness of the recruitment plan and agree on any needed changes. Vermont supports recruiters' attendance at national trainings. Also the State ID&R Coordinator is responsible for annually updating the recruiters' handbook and it includes the latest OME guidance on recruitment and includes the model of training recommended from our participation in the ConQIR consortium and procedures suggested on the MERC website. If there is any question regarding eligibility the State Director of Migrant Education makes the final decision. Vermont has supported attendance by both the ID&R Coordinator and recruiters at the National ID&R Conferences.

Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. In some cases schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed, a recruiter is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list. Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy.

In October, a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME. Several trial runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match.

Finally the State has implemented a reinterview procedure to ensure the quality of our data. 20% of each month's COE's receive a reinterview. The manner is modeled after the procedure Vermont used in the voluntary reinterview process and further refined by procedures implemented during our participation in ConQIR.

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.

There are three primary avenues for which Recruiters find and enroll potentially eligible students; school agricultural employment surveys,farm visits and in-house MEP teacher and recruiter referrals. Each avenue a recruiter uses to locate their eligible migrant students has an element of quality control. For example, of the hundreds of agricultural employment surveys that pass through our ID&R office only a very
small percentage turn out eligible students. We carefully screen these candidates and if they appear eligible, only then do we conduct prescreening phone interview. If after this screening phone call a family still seems migrant eligible we will set up a time for a more formal in person interview. Many students that appear to be migrant eligible at first glance actually turn out to not qualify upon further investigation.
These pre-interview screenings are not included in our Re-Interview data as they never had a COE completed. These families were notified
directly on the spot of the pre-screening that they were not migrant eligible. Because this process occurs prior to completing a COE, students are never enrolled into the system.

As determined by the VT MEP's ID&R Quality Control Plan, a 20% random sample is conducted monthly for all COE's that are completed by VMEP Recruitment staff. This proactive "Rolling Reinterview" process allows us to conduct reinterview's prior to a student's enrollment into our program. This sample size is determined by tallying all new COEs completed during the corresponding month, calculating 20%,and then pulling one in every five for reinterview.The selection is stratified by recruitment area as well. All re-interviews were conducted over the telephone by the state ID&R coordinator, or when practical in person. In all cases, the reinterview is always conducted
by someone other than the initial recruiter. A standard reinterview protocol is utilized for conducting and recording the interviews and is

based upon recommended procedures from our participation in ConQIR and recent migrant education guidance.

Results from the period 9/1/08 through 8/30/09:
New COEs collected during the period 140
Reinterviews conducted 29 or 20.7%
Total errors 1 or .03%

Our Quality Control Plan is designed to prevent actual enrollment of erroneous COEs and during this period, NONE OF THE STUDENTS WITH ERRONEOUS COEs WERE ENROLLED OR INCLUDED IN THE CHILD COUNT. THUS, I FEEL CONFIDENT THAT ALL STUDENTS COUNTED IN THE CHILD COUNT ARE ELIGIBLE. The errors found was in one area -different dates of birth given especially by out-of-school youth. As a result of our updated training and monitoring of recruiters, our error rate has significantly decreased.

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.

Information is entered as COEs are done and at least weekly. Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. In some cases schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed a recruiter is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list.

Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In October a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed (for both Category 1 & 2 counts) by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME/EDEN. Several runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has already implemented a rigorous quality control plan. In addition through our participation in the ConQIR consortium and ID&R trainings, we have been able to review our procedures with those of other states and against best practices. We employ a number of "standardized" forms and procedures. By improving our recruiting procedures and by continually reinterviewing we will attain our goal of a 0% error rate.

Our challenge this year is to fully understand the new ID&R regulations and then review our eligibility checklists to ensure that Vermont is in compliance with the new regulations. We have made changes to trainings and forms and in addition have been collecting data on mobility for over a year. We are currently compiling and analyzing the data.

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.

We have no concerns at present.