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 2009-10

ALASKA

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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, 2009-10 Part II, 2009-10

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Address:
PO Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Margaret MacKinnon

Telephone: 907-465-2970

Fax: 907-465-2989

e-mail: margaret.mackinnon@alaska.gov

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

Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 3:44:38 PM

Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10

PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned. Alaska is in the process of conducting a standards review but does not have a standards revision implementation plan with specific dates yet developed.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111 (b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned. Alaska is in the process of conducting a standards review but does not have a standards revision implementation plan with specific dates yet developed. Alaska will likely make revisions to the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science in Spring 2012. The target for revising the State's assessments will likely occur in Spring 2015.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available unders ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	31.1
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	68.9
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments:	

1.2 Participation in State Assessments

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	77,559		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	17,488		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,242		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	2,830		>97
Hispanic	4,638		>97
White, non-Hispanic	40,896		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,600		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,351		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	34,269		>97
Migratory students	5,007		>97
Male	39,955		>97
Female	37,604		>97
Comments:			

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	1,682	16.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,026	77.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	625	6.0
Total	10,333	
Comments: Alaska does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level or on modified achievement standards.		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment
This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	77,559		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	17,488		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,242		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	2,830		>97
Hispanic	4,638		>97
White, non-Hispanic	40,896		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,600		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,351	8,050	96.4
Economically disadvantaged students	34,269		>97
Migratory students	5,007		>97
Male	39,955		>97
Female	37,604		>97
Comments:			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,636	15.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,035	78.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	625	6.1
Total	10,296	
Comments: Alaska does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level or on modified achievement standards.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	28,976	27,652	95.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,520	6,197	95.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,317	2,259	>97
Black, non-Hispanic	1,030	989	96.0
Hispanic	1,703	1,629	95.7
White, non-Hispanic	15,403	14,658	95.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,783	3,597	95.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,040	2,892	95.1
Economically disadvantaged students	12,229	11,660	95.3
Migratory students	1,846	1,772	96.0
Male	14,864	14,160	95.3
Female	14,112	13,492	95.6
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,063	29.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,270	63.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	264	7.3
Total	3,597	
Comments: Alaska does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		

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	9,788	7,549	77.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,276	1,297	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	811	601	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	357	239	66.9
Hispanic	592	471	79.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,953	4,282	86.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,464	768	52.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,420	659	46.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,809	3,246	67.5
Migratory students	611	389	63.7
Male	5,082	3,872	76.2
Female	4,706	3,677	78.1
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,760	7,770	79.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,272	1,355	59.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	795	595	74.8
Black, non-Hispanic	354	277	78.2
Hispanic	588	473	80.4
White, non-Hispanic	4,952	4,392	88.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,445	677	46.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,393	660	47.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,773	3,355	70.3
Migratory students	610	408	66.9
Male	5,064	3,860	76.2
Female	4,696	3,910	83.3
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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: Alaska does not assess students in science in grade 3.			

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	9,842	7,449	75.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,259	1,301	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	766	569	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	380	256	67.4
Hispanic	639	467	73.1
White, non-Hispanic	4,991	4,225	84.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,534	710	46.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,175	451	38.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,641	3,063	66.0
Migratory students	612	400	65.4
Male	5,067	3,764	74.3
Female	4,775	3,685	77.2
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,834	7,892	80.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,256	1,398	62.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	748	565	75.5
Black, non-Hispanic	379	282	74.4
Hispanic	636	506	79.6
White, non-Hispanic	5,007	4,477	89.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,531	741	48.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,158	428	37.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,622	3,263	70.6
Migratory students	614	424	69.1
Male	5,061	3,911	77.3
Female	4,773	3,981	83.4
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,694	4,806	49.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,229	515	23.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	756	261	34.5
Black, non-Hispanic	380	127	33.4
Hispanic	631	288	45.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,896	3,209	65.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,516	424	28.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,157	86	7.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,579	1,598	34.9
Migratory students	604	184	30.5
Male	4,983	2,522	50.6
Female	4,711	2,284	48.5
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,695	7,364	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,162	1,280	59.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	788	606	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	366	245	66.9
Hispanic	660	484	73.3
White, non-Hispanic	4,993	4,195	84.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,523	665	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	934	341	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,595	3,070	66.8
Migratory students	656	454	69.2
Male	5,029	3,744	74.4
Female	4,666	3,620	77.6
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,689	8,016	82.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,164	1,417	65.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	779	633	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	363	295	81.3
Hispanic	657	529	80.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,998	4,535	90.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,519	750	49.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	915	351	38.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,590	3,417	74.4
Migratory students	656	480	73.2
Male	5,022	3,988	79.4
Female	4,667	4,028	86.3
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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: Alaska does not assess students in science in grade 5.			

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	9,408	7,022	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,183	1,255	57.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	732	523	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	357	219	61.3
Hispanic	579	429	74.1
White, non-Hispanic	4,904	4,086	83.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,360	508	37.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	928	339	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,387	2,829	64.5
Migratory students	637	402	63.1
Male	4,785	3,481	72.7
Female	4,623	3,541	76.6
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,389	7,451	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,174	1,281	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	721	519	72.0
Black, non-Hispanic	360	255	70.8
Hispanic	576	457	79.3
White, non-Hispanic	4,901	4,391	89.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,357	563	41.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	905	236	26.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,372	3,005	68.7
Migratory students	636	395	62.1
Male	4,778	3,631	76.0
Female	4,611	3,820	82.8
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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: Alaska does not assess students in science in grade 6.			

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	9,443	6,575	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,053	1,019	49.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	797	570	71.5
Black, non-Hispanic	345	189	54.8
Hispanic	538	331	61.5
White, non-Hispanic	5,054	4,031	79.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,234	367	29.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	926	244	26.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,099	2,339	57.1
Migratory students	609	358	58.8
Male	4,877	3,294	67.5
Female	4,566	3,281	71.9
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,451	7,894	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,059	1,345	65.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	783	634	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	344	271	78.8
Hispanic	536	430	80.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,068	4,650	91.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,237	599	48.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	908	354	39.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,100	3,049	74.4
Migratory students	613	428	69.8
Male	4,872	3,887	79.8
Female	4,579	4,007	87.5
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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: Alaska does not assess students in science in grade 7.			

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	9,362	6,546	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,093	1,105	52.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	748	513	68.6
Black, non-Hispanic	297	155	52.2
Hispanic	555	373	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,030	3,964	78.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,172	335	28.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	901	247	27.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,934	2,229	56.7
Migratory students	663	379	57.2
Male	4,792	3,322	69.3
Female	4,570	3,224	70.5
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,369	7,962	85.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,097	1,479	70.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	744	609	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	293	233	79.5
Hispanic	547	473	86.5
White, non-Hispanic	5,048	4,633	91.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,168	543	46.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	889	418	47.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,923	2,982	76.0
Migratory students	665	485	72.9
Male	4,791	3,911	81.6
Female	4,578	4,051	88.5
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	9,127	5,131	56.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,056	644	31.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	744	328	44.1
Black, non-Hispanic	290	107	36.9
Hispanic	542	273	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	4,877	3,436	70.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,142	239	20.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	877	72	8.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,828	1,509	39.4
Migratory students	652	239	36.7
Male	4,656	2,680	57.6
Female	4,471	2,451	54.8
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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	18,516	11,512	62.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,035	1,763	43.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,531	904	59.0
Black, non-Hispanic	684	286	41.8
Hispanic	990	557	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	10,204	7,335	71.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,046	447	21.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,883	399	21.2
Economically disadvantaged students	7,100	3,398	47.9
Migratory students	1,138	590	51.8
Male	9,524	5,923	62.2
Female	8,992	5,589	62.2

Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup. The count in high school is approximately double the grades 3-8 because both grades 9 and 10 are tested in high school.

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	18,556	15,068	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,044	2,550	63.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,534	1,118	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	679	476	70.1
Hispanic	994	791	79.6
White, non-Hispanic	10,231	9,247	90.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,039	881	43.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,882	638	33.9
Economically disadvantaged students	7,101	4,890	68.9
Migratory students	1,145	810	70.7
Male	9,542	7,445	78.0
Female	9,014	7,623	84.6

Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup. The count in high school is approximately double the grades 3-8 because both grades 9 and 10 are tested in high school.

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	8,831	5,644	63.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,912	789	41.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	759	396	52.2
Black, non-Hispanic	319	136	42.6
Hispanic	456	275	60.3
White, non-Hispanic	4,885	3,725	76.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	939	270	28.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	858	116	13.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,253	1,518	46.7
Migratory students	516	251	48.6
Male	4,521	2,982	66.0
Female	4,310	2,662	61.8
Comments: The differences between the total students tested in grades 3-8 and the sum of the students tested by racial/ethnic groups are represented by the students in the multi-ethnic subgroup.			

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	505	303	60.0
Districts	54	20	37.0
Comments:			

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 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	292	182	62.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	133	83	62.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	159	99	62.3
Comments:			

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
50	16	32.0
Comments:		

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[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).

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	3
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	3
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	17
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (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).

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.

Alaska requires districts identified for improvement and corrective action to submit district improvement plans for review and approval by the department. Those plans are reviewed and technical assistance is provided to districts. Recommendations are provided for improvement in the plans. Technical assistance audio conferences are held to discuss requirements of district improvement plans and strategies for improvement. Presentations on using data to drive instructional decisions and on using formative assessments aligned to state standards have been by audio conference and at major state conferences.

When a district reaches the level of corrective action, the department performs a desk audit of available data, including district student achievement and AYP data. The department also conducts school-level desk audits of all schools in the state to identify the lowest performing schools that need additional analysis and support. Many of these identified schools are Title I schools, but some are not.

Based on the desk-audit review of district data, the school-level desk audits, and conversations with district superintendents, districts are identified that will receive an on-site visit by an Instructional Audit Team in selected schools in the district to identify the schools' strengths and challenges. A team of Alaskan educators visits schools in corrective action or restructuring to examine documents, observe classroom instruction and interview teachers, administrators and students. Their work is guided by the Instructional Audit Tool, developed by the Alaska Comprehensive Center in collaboration with the department, which focuses on six domains relevant to school improvement planning: curriculum, instruction, assessment, school learning environment, professional development and leadership. The department takes corrective action in a district that is most likely to positively impact student achievement. The corrective action plans typically require districts to implement these key elements: universal screening for all students at least 3 times per year for placement in interventions and progress monitoring (RTI); frequent teacher collaboration meetings to discuss student progress monitoring data, formative assessments, and other pertinent data to improve instruction and implement appropriate interventions; and instructional leader classroom walkthroughs for teacher feedback to improve instructional quality.

The department has received increased funding from the legislature to enable the department to provide additional support and training to districts in improvement and corrective action. In addition to the Title I Administrator and the School Improvement Program Manger, additional staff positions in the State System of Support (SSOS) provide support provided to all Title I districts in improvement or corrective action with both Title I and non-Title I schools. The SSOS team includes an administrator, a program specialist, a program associate, and will have content support specialists in reading, math, and science when the team is fully staffed. Support is provided to districts in a 3- tiered model. Districts in improvement and corrective action (Tiers II and III) receive more directed technical assistance than that available to all districts in Tier I. The department has trained Technical Assistance Coaches and each district receives the assistance of a coach. The department has also provided directed technical assistance and workshops in using formative assessments and progress monitoring tools (such as AimsWeb), effective school leadership, teacher collaboration, and curriculum alignment and mapping. The department has also developed a cadre of Content Coaches, distinguished Alaskan educators, to work with teachers and site instructional leaders in specific content areas for strategies, methods, and classroom management. The majority of their work is with Tier III districts in concert with the technical assistance coaches. The Content Coaches began work in the 2009-2010 school year.

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	20
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	1	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/06/10

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2010.
  - 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 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	**SY 2009-10**	**SY 2008-09**
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 2009-10	14,304	13,400
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 2009-10	7,889	9,738
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 2009-10	55.2	72.7
Total number of students who completed the **reading/language arts** assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	14,258	13,395
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 2009-10	9,014	11,356
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 2009-10	63.2	84.8
Comments:		

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that **made adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10	45
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2009-10	11
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10	73
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

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 (strategies) was(were) used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), 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 (strategies)** (See response options in *"Column 6 Response Options Box"* below)	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"** This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		103	7	30	D	Made AYP in one or more subgroups through safe harbor.
2		105	8	26	D	Made AYP in one or more subgroups through safe harbor.
6 = Combo 1		94	6	24	D	Made AYP in one or more subgroups through safe harbor.
5	Extended learning opportunities through tutoring and/or summer school	45	3	12	D	Made AYP in oner or more subgroups through safe harbor.
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

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.

The department shares effective school improvement strategies primarily by providing workshops on specific strategies and by providing sessions at the annual Winter Education Conference. The department has sponsored workshops in Response to Instruction/Intervention and workshops in Curriculum Alignment targeted to districts in corrective action. General sessions and breakout sessions have been provided at the Winter Conference on RTI, formative assessments, using data to make instructional decisions, effective teacher collaboration meetings, progress monitoring tools, and more. In addition, for the past several years, teams of educators from schools that were showing progress in AYP have been invited to participate at the Winter Education Conference to share the strategies they have used in their schools. The Title I Distinguished Schools have also been asked to present at the Winter Education Conference. In addition, in June 2010, the second Summer Leadership Institute was provided to leadership teams including superintendents and principals from 18 districts in the state. The focus of this institute was "Leadership to Turn-Around and Transform Student Learning and Organizational Performance." Sessions included effective collaboration and professional learning communities; balanced leadership framework; using strategies, protocols and tools to analyze data; and aligning state standards, instructional practices, and assessments.

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 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:

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

For SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Alaska used state-level funds from the SIG 1003(g) grant to support the creation of the application documents, the review of the applications, and the general technical assistance to districts in understanding the application requirements and submitting applications for funding. The technical assistance was provided through a series of audio conferences, slide presentations, and individual conference calls with eligible districts. Alaska also used state-level funds to support additional data collection and analysis to determine the lists of eligible schools and for evaluation of the schools implementing SIG 1003(g) grants.

The largest share of the state-level funding was used to expand the capacity of the State System of Support (SSOS) to provide on-site support and assistance to the LEAs and schools in greatest need in the state. The SSOS services are targeted to six domains for instructional effectiveness: curriculum (aligned with the Alaska grade level expectations or GLEs); assessment (formative and summative assessments are used regularly to inform instruction); instruction (effective strategies are used to meet the needs of diverse learners); supportive learning environment (a positive school climate provides a safe, orderly environment conducive to learning); professional development (based on data, the needs of the students and schools, and aligned with academic goals); and leadership (school leadership focused on instruction and improving student achievement).

The Alaska State System of Support (SSOS) staff at the SEA level included three employees for the 2009-2010 school year (one administrator and two school support program managers). The SSOS Administrator and the Title I/NCLB Administrator co-oversee the implementation of the SIG grants in the Tier I and Tier II schools, assisting the districts in determining the most appropriate support needed for each school. The SSOS program staff members provide on-site support to districts and coordinate training opportunities for our state defined "Tier III" districts - those high need districts in which the state is requiring specific interventions. In addition, the state provides support through the SSOS contractors. Six Technical Assistance Coaches (TACs) provide specialized support to these districts in one or more domains in their area of expertise. In addition, the SSOS team includes ten contractors called Content Coaches (CCs) with expertise in the areas of reading, math, science, graphic & visual arts, and performing arts. These contractors provide on-site support and training for teachers in their areas of expertise. A portion of the SIG state-level funds will be used to provide additional contract time for TACs and CCs.

The SIG state-level funds were used to support specific professional development opportunities related to one or more of the six domains based on the needs identified by the schools and LEAs that receive the SIG grants. Examples of professional development provided by the SSOS in 2009-2010 include Curriculum Alignment Institutes and School Leadership institutes. The Curriculum Alignment institutes were provided to district teams with curriculum specialists in language arts and math. In 2009-10, the institute continued to support the curriculum alignment process by providing two separate sessions: Curriculum Mapping with Ann Johnson from Curriculum Designers; alignment of classroom formative assessments with Debbie Farrington from Measured Progress. The second Alaska School Leadership Institutes (ASLI) was held in June 2010. This purpose of this institute, held in collaboration with the Rural Alaska Principal Preparation Project, was to learn how to lead using the strategies and actions necessary to turn-around and transform student learning and organizational performance.

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 2009-10 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.

In 2009-2010, the State of Alaska continued to fund three staff positions supported by state general funds to coordinate and implement its State System of Support (SSOS). While the SSOS provides the most intensive support to the lowest performing schools and districts, both Title I and non-Title I, the vast majority of schools and districts supported by the SSOS are Title I schools and districts in improvement or above. SSOS supports districts in building their own capacity to sustain student growth. Examining district and school data, it coordinates and provides resources to districts and schools appropriate to their students' achievement levels. SSOS brings training, written and online materials, and technical assistance in three broad areas: assessment, leadership, and collaboration. Resources include leveraging general funds (with ESEA funding) to support webinars, workshops, institutes, noted elsewhere, such as the Curriculum Alignment Institute and the Alaska School Leadership Institute. Within cultural/community settings, resources address supports for student academics (reading, math, science, the arts) and behavior (Positive Behavior Supports). Human resources include technical assistance coaches, content coaches, coaches for new administrators, and mentors for new teachers.

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	20,150
Applied to transfer	108
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	106
Comments:	

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	$ 50,464

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	20

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.

Comments: 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	17,801
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,057
Received supplemental educational services	2,744
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 3,017,245
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.

	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	22,629	20,569	90.9	2,060	9.1
All elementary classes	4,608	4,346	94.3	262	5.7
All secondary classes	18,021	16,223	90.0	1,798	10.0

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 a full-day self contained elementary class as 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	88.8
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	8.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.4
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)	85.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	12.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.0
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	552	518	93.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,697	1,543	90.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,860	2,431	85.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	5,631	5,081	90.2
1.5.3.1 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.			

1.5.3.1 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	82.0	31.0
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	56.1	23.2
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

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

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

1.6 Title III and Language Instructional Programs

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	16,759

Comments:

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	15,375

Comments:

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
Yupik languages	6,177
Spanish; Castilian	1,900
Inupiaq	1,712
Filipino; Pilipino	1,265
Hmong	1,215

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	14,987
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,772
Total	16,759
Comments: The % of LEP students tested in the state is approximately 90%.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,553
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP	10.4
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	13,767
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,608
Total	15,375
Comments: The percent of Title III LEP students tested on the state ELP assessment is 90%.	
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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. 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 students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	2,210

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		**Targets**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**
Making progress	3,547	30.7		37.00
Attained proficiency	1,446	10.5		15.00
Comments: The automatic percent calculations in the chart above for making progress and attaining proficiency do not align with the state's definition. The state's definition for the percent of students making progress and the percent attaining proficiency is based on all identified LEP students, not just students tested. Using the state's definition, the percent of LEP students making progress is 26.95% and the percent of LEP students attaining proficiency is 9.4%.				

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 determinant.

Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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)

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
1,599	1,127	2,726
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,077	1,638	78.9	439
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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
2,084	1,841	88.3	243
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
716	279	39.0	437
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	15
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	5
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	3
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	3
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	8
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	14
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	12
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	11

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
Comments: The state does not have any Title III consortia.

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:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals? No

If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.
Comments:

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,438	158	1

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	107
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	31

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	14	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	14	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	12	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	8	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	10	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	14	1,996
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	516
PD provided to principals	12	151
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	10	66
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	13	382
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	50
Total	14	3,161

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/02/09	10/01/09	89
Comments:		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Funds are available for reimbursement to subgrantees, effective July 1, 2009, immediately upon approval of the consolidated application. The state continually works with LEAs to revise and reach an approved state for the consolidated application that includes Title III funds. Due to the timing of the application submission (late June, 2009) and the summer when district staff are unavailable, most district applications are approved in the fall and some individual districts take longer, especially when there has been staff turnover. The department has provided an on-site technical assistance workshop in late April to encourage completion and submission of applications in early May to facilitate earlier approval for the 2010-2011 school year and will continue to do that for future applications.

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:** Alaska does not have any schools that are identified as persistently dangerous schools.	

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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	43.0
Limited English proficient	49.0
Economically disadvantaged	60.0
Migratory students	68.0
Male	64.0
Female	70.0
Comments: Graduation rates not shown in the chart above are: American Indian or Alaska Native - 55%; Asian or Pacific Islander - 66.8%; Black, non-Hispanic - 60%; Hispanic - 63.9%; White, non-Hispanic - 74%	

FAQs on graduation rates:

a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
   - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
   - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
   - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5.5
Hispanic	4.7
White, non-Hispanic	4.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5.8
Limited English proficient	11.3
Economically disadvantaged	5.4
Migratory students	9.7
Male	5.6
Female	4.8
Comments:	

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	50	50
LEAs with subgrants	4	4
Total	54	54
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)	N<25	95
K	49	277
1	54	267
2	52	244
3	40	247
4	49	240
5	38	230
6	31	195
7	28	228
8	41	222
9	41	230
10	54	273
11	67	414
12	75	423
Ungraded		
Total	633	3,585
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	293	832
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	271	1,955
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	33	514
Hotels/Motels	36	284
Total	633	3,585
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)	94
K	274
1	258
2	236
3	244
4	238
5	224
6	194
7	224
8	213
9	225
10	273
11	391
12	409
Ungraded	
Total	3,497
Comments:	

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	920
Migratory children/youth	268
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	811
Limited English proficient students	597
Comments:	

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	2
Staff professional development and awareness	4
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
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	1
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other #1: Assistance to youth with college and/or financial aid applications
Other #2: Assistance with laundry & shower vouches & personal hygiene items

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	225	146
4	217	138
5	210	145
6	172	103
7	190	130
8	188	136
High School	372	225
Comments:		

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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	229	145
4	219	132
5	213	136
6	174	94
7	189	96
8	190	92
High School	372	137
Comments:		

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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:

a. 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.

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	778
K	760
1	624
2	709
3	745
4	741
5	751
6	766
7	708
8	768
9	762
10	721
11	666
12	691
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	185
Total	10,375
Comments: Alaska does not use the Ungraded category.	

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 increase was less than 10%.

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	145
K	101
1	93
2	72
3	116
4	97
5	99
6	81
7	75
8	83
9	111
10	106
11	102
12	29
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<25
Total	1,329
Comments:	

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 increase or decrease is less than 10%

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Alaska Migrant Education Program used MIS2000 as our migrant student information system to compile and generate our 2009-2010 child count for both Categories 1 and 2. Our child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data collected and maintained in MIS2000 includes student demographic and move information provided on the COE.

The same information is collected for regular and summer terms. The type of information collected on the COE:

1. Student Name - legal (last name 1, last name 2, first, middle)
2. Alaska Student ID number
3. Birth Data -sex, data of birth, age, multiple birth, ethnicity, place of birth
4. Current School Information -school name, enrollment date and grade
5. Parents' names - mother's and father's names (last and first)
6. Current address - the family's physical address
7. Mailing address - if different from the family's physical address
8. Eligibility Data -residency date; qualifying arrival date; move (to-from) information; name of qualifying worker; check boxes for "with," "to join,"(for to join moves, the date the qualifying worker moved is recorded and must be within 12 months of the child's QAD) or "on own"; check boxes to indicate whether the qualifying worker was the parent, guardian, or spouse; check boxes to indicate if the qualifying worker moved to obtain qualifying work, moved to obtain any work and obtained qualifying work, or moved to obtain qualifying work specifically, but did not obtain the work; check boxes for seasonal or temporary work; check boxes to indicate if the work was agriculture or fishing; a check box to indicate if the qualifying work was for personal subsistence; description of work -type of catch/crop/logging camp and type of gear/activity. Qualifying work activity information is found in our Alaska Harvest Manual: Reference Manual for Records Managers and Recruiters. This publication is updated yearly.
9. Comments -This is the area where additional information or details regarding the family are recorded. This includes: the reason for a "to join" move; the worker or employer's statement for a temporary move, prior history and/or credible evidence if the qualifying worker did not obtain qualifying work, the qualifying worker's address and contact information if different from the children's, as well as a statement verifying the family's economic necessity for the activity.
10. Additional Moves- This area is used to collect additional migrant work activity moves made in a one-year time period.

Additional information comes from regular term Mass Withdrawal forms and Summer School Mass Enrollment and Withdrawal forms, and includes enroll/withdraw dates, grades, termination codes and supplemental programs information. School districts assist the state with recruitment efforts. They hire recruiters to conduct the interviews with the families and complete the necessary forms.
Using a pre-printed or blank COE form, recruiters interview parents and ask relevant questions in order to accurately complete the information required on the COE (effective interview techniques are presented in the Alaska Harvest Manual and at Fall Training). Migrant move and student information is written on the COE form throughout the interview. As the interview comes to an end, the recruiter reviews the completed COE form for accuracy using checklists in the training materials. If any information is unclear, the recruiter will ask additional clarifying questions. The parent reviews the COE for accuracy and signs the COE to verify that the information is correct.

Recruiters work in conjunction with school secretaries or home-school liaison staff in order to identify new families that move into their communities and to interview them for possible migrant activities.
The majority of recruitment for eligible migrant students is done in the fall because most qualifying work activities take place during the summer. The fishing seasons are determined by nature and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and vary depending on the species being harvested. Because of the remote, isolated fish camp locations and large distances between villages (where schools are located) and fish camp sites, it is not possible to have recruitment staff available at the fish camp sites. The recruitment therefore takes place immediately after the summer fishing season from mid-August to November. During that period, all new migrant moves are documented and all currently eligible migrant student families are interviewed to determine whether a new move was made.

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.

When COEs are completed and signed by the recruiter and the parent, the COE is sent to the district office where the district records manager will review the COE for errors or ambiguity and ascertain whether the family actually meets the migrant eligibility criteria. Once the records manager feels confident that the COE is error free and that the family meets migrant eligibility, and after the district SEA Designated Reviewer reviews and signs the COE, the records manager enters the COE into the student information system, MIS2000. Each district has one workstation with MIS2000 and one records manager trained in the database; this controls data input into the system.

When COEs are entered onto the district's MIS2000 workstation and uploaded, then the COE data is electronically transferred to the State of Alaska's main server.

The full MIS2000 database is housed on the State of Alaska Department of Administration's main server. This database contains all records inputted by districts into MIS2000. When a district finishes an electronic upload, eligibility specialists at the Alaska Migrant Education Office will review the submitted COEs. In situations where COEs need additional or updated information, an e-mail will be sent to the district. Districts will then have the opportunity to resubmit the updated COEs through the same electronic process. When COEs are first entered, they are marked with a "Ready for Review" status. After the COE has been reviewed it will then be placed in one of three categories: Incomplete, Cancelled, or Active. Incomplete means that the COE seems to meet eligibility requirements but additional information is needed. Cancelled means that the COE does not meet eligibility requirements and the family has been made ineligible. Active means that the COE is complete and the family meets eligibility requirements. When a COE is marked as Active, all children on the COE are marked as eligible. The eligibility specialists routinely run reports from the MIS2000 database to determine the status of COEs.

Once COE data has been inputted and updated by district staff and has met eligibility requirements, the data is ready to be organized into the CSPR Part 1 report. To do this, an identification and recruitment specialist runs a report in MIS2000's "Report Builder" menu that pulls an extract of all students with a school history line between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10. This extract pulls students based on their Student Sequence number, a unique number assigned by MIS2000 that cannot be manipulated by users. Selecting the data by Student Sequence number ensures that each individual record is pulled and eliminates the possibility of duplication. Once the extract has been successfully imported into Microsoft Access, various queries are performed to ensure that the data is accurate, complete, and absent of any duplication. These queries are used to pinpoint incorrect data entry along with data integrity errors. From these queries, identification and recruitment specialists are able to work with eligibility specialists and district staff to fix the remaining errors. Once all reports have been run and the accuracy of the information has been examined and verified, the count is certified and submitted.

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.

Not applicable.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alaska Migrant Education Program develops a series of queries for the MIS2000 database that provide the data necessary to ensure an accurate child count.

Regular Term (category 1)

-Residency 09/01/09-08/31/10

- Must be 3 years old
- Must be less than 20 years old, except for students with disabilities

-Unduplicated -run alpha by state (student name, Student ID, birth date, parents' names, QAD, residency date, enrollment

date) -QAD within last three years

- Check for termination codes

-Verify with districts on 12th graders not graduated

Summer Term (category 2)
-Make sure regular and summer enrollments do not overlap

- Must be 3 years old
- Must be less than 20 years old, except for students with disabilities

-Unduplicated -run alpha by state (name, ID, birth date, parents'

names) -QAD within last three years.

-Enrolled in MEP funded summer school

-Be sure these students are also included in category 1 count.

The child count data is compiled by running several reports in MIS2000 and queries in Microsoft Access. First, a report is run in MIS2000 which provides an alphabetical listing of eligible children, ages 3-20 who, within three years of making a qualifying move, resided in Alaska for one or more days during the period from September 1, 2009 -August 31, 2010. There are separate reports for the regular school term and summer term. Additional "find duplicate" queries are run on this eligible student list in Microsoft Access to examine such issues as
duplicate student ID numbers, names, multiple births, date of birth and terminations. When duplication occurs, the student records are researched in MIS2000 by examining the COE and student data. If additional clarification is needed, MEO staff contact the district or family directly to resolve whether the data reflects two separate students or is duplicate information for the same student. All duplicates are identified and removed (or merged, if appropriate) in MIS2000, so they do not appear in the final eligible student list or eligible student count reports.

For both regular and summer terms, the MEO staff run queries to make sure the child count contains students who fit the following criteria:

1. Residency 09/01/09 -08/31/10
2. Must be 3 years old
3. Must be less than 20 years old, except for students with disabilities
4. QAD within the last three years
5. COEs status active and eligible

The State of Alaska Migrant Education Program develops a series of queries for the MIS2000 database that provide the data necessary to ensure an accurate child count.

The MEO staff ensures that the children in the state database who turn three during the funding period are still residing in the state. As part of the state's identification and recruitment process, children are tracked by the state database from the first time they make qualifying moves with their families. Since all children with eligibility are contacted yearly and their information is verified, it is not necessary to send specific information to the recruiters.

For the summer term, the students must be enrolled in a Migrant Education Program funded summer school. These summer school students are included in the regular term count. Students who attend summer school only must be reflected in the category 1 count. The queries are run to ensure that the regular and summer enrollments do not overlap.

The eligible student list and child count information from MIS2000 is edited and filtered through several additional queries. Regarding 12th grade students, MEO checks for graduation termination codes. If no code is present, MEO verifies with districts that the students have not graduated. Queries are run to check for twins and triplets and the information is crosschecked with the student record in MIS2000. As mentioned above, several queries are run to locate and resolve duplicate information.

The following is an example of how duplications are handled. John Smith, born 8/1/90 would be noted if another John Smith, born 5/1/98 was on the list. Or, two Mary Smiths each having Robert Smith as a parent would be highlighted. Even students with the same last name and same parents that have been born within an unusually small time period (such as within 10 days of each other) are highlighted.
MEO staff run additional queries to find students or COEs that are flagged as ineligible, inactive or not determined. MEO staff review each record with these pending or inactive markers in MIS2000 to verify that the status is accurate. The final eligible student list is edited so it does not include students who are flagged as pending, inactive or ineligible. MEO staff double check the final eligible student list against the final count report to verify that the number of students on each report is identical.

The unduplicated count is run by name, Student ID, birth date and parents' names. For the summer/intersession count, students are not enrolled into the system as having attended summer school unless a supplemental program is also being reported. A report is generated to verify the names of any students enrolled in summer school who did not have a supplemental programs code reported. Districts are also required to maintain documentation of services provided on-site. These are reviewed as part of the program reviews conducted by the Department of Education & Early Development. None of Alaska's districts operated intersession projects during the 2009-2010 count period.

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.

Not applicable.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Alaska Migrant Education Program provides ongoing training and a multi-layered COE quality review process to ensure that migrant student eligibility is properly determined and verified each year. Records managers and recruiters are trained annually in the identification and recruitment process. In the fall, training sessions are held for administrators, records managers and recruiters in six regional centers throughout the state. The three-day training sessions include an in-depth review of eligibility guidelines and extensive practice sessions using ID&R tools (i.e. Alaska Harvest Manual, Recruiter Guide) to determine eligibility and properly complete COEs. All training materials are updated annually and distributed to all district staff who are responsible for migrant education identification and recruitment. Training continues during the fall recruitment season on an individual basis. District records managers work one-on-one with new recruiters. ID&R specialists work with district staff on additional training needs and plans designed specifically for individual districts. Every COE is reviewed for compliance with eligibility guidelines at least three times before it is entered in MIS2000. The recruiter first reviews the COE with the parent when conducting the family interview and obtaining signatures. The records manager conducts a quality review of the COE verifying all the information and signatures. If the records manager finds an error or needs more clarification, s/he instructs the recruiter to re-¬contact the family. The SEA Designated Reviewer conducts a third review of the COE and s/he verifies that the COE meets eligibility guidelines by signing the COE form. Once all signatures are received, the district records manager enters the COE data into MIS2000 and s/he verifies that the electronic and paper COEs match verbatim.

In addition to these quality control procedures, MEO staff meets regularly throughout the year to assess program needs and develop new quality improvement ideas. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet weekly to discuss any districts that are having difficulty completing COEs or making proper eligibility determinations. The group collectively decides on internal actions or new procedures that can be developed to resolve the problem most efficiently. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet on a weekly basis with the migrant education program manager to discuss specific COE eligibility (as noted above) and any new information pertaining to national laws and guidance. Under the program manager's guidance, the MEO team reviews the long-term training needs and quality improvement efforts that can be implemented during the following school year.

MEO staff also provide ongoing training and communication with districts to improve the quality of our program. For example, ID&R specialists send routine emails to records managers to address common questions and issues that arise during the COE quality review process. This is beneficial to districts with a new or inexperienced staff that may have questions once they begin the recruiting after fall training. Districts can also request an audio conference with their recruiters or MEO staff to discuss problems they are having with the ID&R process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alaska ID&R specialists visit approximately 10 districts per year as a part of the technical assistance program. During these on-site technical assistance visits, ID&R specialists conduct a thorough review of the district's identification and recruitment procedures, migrant student files and compliance with eligibility guidelines. Using a Random Student Sample Report generated from MIS2000, the ID&R specialist contacts families in sequential order from the list. The ID&R specialist re-interviews the family regarding migrant activity using the Migrant Eligibility Interview Protocol form for the interview. The information from the interview is then compared to the current COE for accuracy. Every effort is made to contact families that have been recruited by each recruiter in the district. The completed Migrant Eligibility Interview Protocol form is kept on file at the MEO.

During the 2009-2010 school year, 131 students were re-interviewed. From the re-interview, all students were found to be eligible. Re-interviewing was conducted by the state ID&R specialists who are well-trained in eligibility requirements and have full access to all training materials and federal guidance. Before the re-interviewing begins, the re-interviewers meet and review the re-interviewing process and procedure. All recruitment interviews in Alaska are made by trained recruiters at the LEA level. The SEA re-interviews work independently from the original LEA interviewer.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Migrant Education Office (MEO) follows several quality control procedures throughout the school year to maintain the accuracy and integrity of migrant student data in MIS2000. These procedures center on COE quality reviews, verification reports and random sample COE reviews during technical assistance visits. In order to ensure the integrity of migrant student records and COEs in MIS2000, all data collected from previous years is locked.

In the fall recruitment season, the second phase of the COE review process takes place at the state. Upon receipt of the uploaded COE data in MIS2000, the eligibility specialists quality check every COE (New and No New Move). The eligibility specialists carefully review the COE data to ensure that the migrant activity, migrant move, intent of the move and economic necessity for the migrant activity are clearly in

alignment with eligibility guidelines. They also review the family and student data for accuracy and correct chronological order. Based on this preliminary state review, the electronic COE is flagged as active, incomplete or canceled.

Eligibility specialists then prepare a COE status report for the district records managers to indicate whether COEs are approved, need more information or are denied. The report lists the COE ID number, student names, birth date, State ID number and a space for comments. If approved, a notation of "Approved" is listed in comments. If the COE is incomplete, the eligibility specialist notes the details or questions that need to be answered in order to make an eligibility determination. If the COE is denied, this is noted on the report. These COE status reports are kept at the MEO to track the adjustments made to COEs. In MIS2000, the COE and student records remain in "incomplete" and "not determined" status while the district is obtaining the additional information. MEO staff run frequent reports of all students in "not determined status" to capture these pending cases and ensure that they are resolved prior to the child count deadline. Once the district obtains and uploads the additional information, the eligibility specialists conduct a final review and make a final eligibility determination.

If the eligibility specialists question data on a COE, they pass the COE on to the ID&R specialists for a secondary review. If more clarification is needed, the ID&R specialists will contact the records manager at the district to ask more detailed questions or instruct the recruiter to ask for more specific clarification from the family. Upon receipt of updated COE information in MIS2000 the eligibility specialists make a final eligibility determination and update the COE status in MIS2000 accordingly.

In cases where the COE data is still not clear, or when the eligibility determination is difficult to make, the MEO staff conducts a third in-¬house quality check of the COE. Under the guidance of the migrant education program manager, the MEO staff meets to discuss the facts of the case as a group and closely consult the 2010 Non-Regulatory Guidance. The group documents the date, factors discussed and outcome on the COE form and the eligibility specialists or ID&R specialists follow through accordingly.

MEO staff run internal verification reports from MIS2000 to ensure that uploaded COE data is complete and that eligibility determinations are accurate. During the fall recruitment season, eligibility specialists run weekly reports of pending student records that are flagged as "not determined" and COEs that are flagged as "ready for review" or "incomplete." There are separate reports for New and No New Move COEs. The resulting student lists are checked against COE status reports to determine the steps necessary for making the final eligibility determination. ID&R specialists run statewide reports from MIS2000 to review and monitor COE data upload activity by districts and gauge the rate at which the work is completed. The ID&R specialists then use the report data to spot check COEs and assist districts with any COE entry issues. Eligibility specialists continue to run these "pending status" reports throughout the year on a weekly basis. ID&R specialists run additional quarterly reports to check for potential duplicate records, discrepancies in student data (such as ID number or date of birth) or incorrect chronology when students migrate between schools or districts in a school year. Discrepancies are resolved by the ID&R specialists who contact districts and the state assessments office to obtain the correct information in MIS2000.

If a student is reported or discovered to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R specialist at the MEO follows an eligibility termination procedure to research, terminate and report this misidentification. At training, districts are instructed to contact the MEO if they find problems or discrepancies with any COE at any point in the year. The ID&R specialists investigate any potential eligibility problems that are either reported by districts or are discovered during regular quality checks at the MEO. ID&R specialists document the issue, conduct an investigation, document initial findings and then meet with the Migrant Education Program Manager to discuss the case and make a final determination.

If a student is determined to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R specialist terminates the student and COE in MIS2000 under the code "I" (ineligible) to indicate the student was terminated because they were found ineligible. This changes the record from "active and eligible" to "cancelled and ineligible." The reason for the termination is added to all affected COEs in the database. Reference is made to the additional documentation made by the ID&R specialist. This additional documentation consists of a list of all affected student names, ID numbers and COE ID numbers and a detailed description of the problem, how it was researched, findings by the ID&R specialist, the official date of termination and proof that the termination was completed in MIS2000 (print screens). The ID&R specialist then notifies the district in writing that the student is terminated, the reason for this decision and the effective date of the termination. The district is informed that the MEO has terminated the student in MIS2000 and is instructed to complete the termination by documenting the termination on the original COE in the district file. Districts must write the termination code "I" (ineligible) and reason for the ineligibility finding on each affected COE form.

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.

MEO staff do several final reviews to verify the accuracy of the child count produced in MIS2000 for this report. MEO staff first review the SQL (Structured Query Language are the parameters set for the queries used to produce the counts and other reports on a computerized relational database) of the queries used for the counts in category 1 and category 2. As described above, several queries are run on the eligible student list to identify duplicate student data and students with ineligible or inactive status in MIS2000. MEO staff research and resolve these issues and then update the electronic student record accordingly. The final eligible student list reflects this editing and review process and thus only includes students who are verified as eligible and active. Several different MEO staff review the final reports and supporting documentation (queries) to ensure that the final count is accurate.

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.

A process is in place at the MEO to respond quickly and effectively should prospective interviewing results question a student's eligibility decision. If a mistake is found on a COE, the ID&R specialist will address these concerns with the district migrant education coordinator

and records manager. The concerns will be brought back to the Migrant Program Manager at the MEO and additional research will be done, if necessary. If a student is determined not to be eligible, the ID&R specialist terminates the student and COE in MIS2000 and notifies the district of the ineligibility status in writing. If a pattern is discovered on the part of a specific recruiter or district, the ID&R specialist will create a district plan of action to clarify the problems and the steps the district must take to resolve them promptly. The plan usually requires the district to conduct additional quality review of COEs. The parameters of this quality review are set by the ID&R specialist and indicate the type of and number of files to review. Re-interview may also be required of the district. Following the visit, the ID&R specialist and district staff keep in regular contact to verify that the plan of action is being followed and the problems resolved.

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.

To the best of our knowledge, the eligibility determinations which are the basis for our child count are sound and accurate.