

**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
ALABAMA**



**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 ED Facts 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
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part I, 2009-10	<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Alabama Department of Education		
Address: 50 North Ripley Street Montgomery, AL 36104		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Brooke Blair		
Telephone: 334-242-8199		
Fax: 334-242-0496		
e-mail: bblair@alsde.edu		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Brooke H. Blair		
Thursday, April 28, 2011, 3:30:18 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.

The State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards on November 18, 2010, for implementation of Mathematics in 2012/2013 and for implementation of English-Language Arts in 2013/2014.

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.

Given that the Common Core State Standards were adopted in November 2010, the state will be developing plans and timelines to make revisions to the state assessments.
--

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 under 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)	20.0
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	50.0
Comments: Remaining funds (30%) were used for purposes such as accountability, data warehouse, and professional development as reported in Question 1.1.3.2.	

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)	No
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	No
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 States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	397,696		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,400		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,865		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	137,971		>97
Hispanic	16,101		>97
White, non-Hispanic	234,136		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41,781		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	8,775		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	226,307		>97
Migratory students	715		>97
Male	203,289		>97
Female	194,407		>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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,122	60.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,755	30.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,453	8.4
Total	41,330	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	397,696		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,400		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,865		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	137,971		>97
Hispanic	16,101		>97
White, non-Hispanic	234,136		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41,783		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,788		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	226,307		>97
Migratory students	715		>97
Male	203,289		>97
Female	194,407		>97
Comments: No Comment			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,130	60.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,772	30.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,464	8.4
Total	41,366	
Comments: Total includes 6 students who took the English Proficiency Test. These will have no level score in the next section.		

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	165,379		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,445		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,957		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	57,280		>97
Hispanic	6,023		>97
White, non-Hispanic	98,264		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,005	16,413	96.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,840	2,721	95.8
Economically disadvantaged students	89,730		>97
Migratory students	257		>97
Male	83,931		>97
Female	81,448		>97
Comments: no comment			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
Comments: no comment		

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	58,196	46,571	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	429	365	85.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	756	703	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,019	14,131	70.6
Hispanic	2,988	2,231	74.7
White, non-Hispanic	33,722	28,904	85.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,099	2,921	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,241	1,538	68.6
Economically disadvantaged students	35,370	26,173	74.0
Migratory students	123	93	75.6
Male	29,951	23,627	78.9
Female	28,245	22,944	81.2
Comments:			

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	58,076	50,132	86.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	427	386	90.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	736	687	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	19,991	15,864	79.4
Hispanic	2,966	2,335	78.7
White, non-Hispanic	33,675	30,602	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,073	3,028	49.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,196	1,569	71.4
Economically disadvantaged students	35,295	28,695	81.3
Migratory students	123	93	75.6
Male	29,878	24,890	83.3
Female	28,198	25,242	89.5
Comments:			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No Science Assessment given in this grade.			

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	58,984	47,847	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	424	88.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	765	721	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,383	14,778	72.5
Hispanic	2,763	2,122	76.8
White, non-Hispanic	34,339	29,594	86.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,213	2,793	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,703	1,155	67.8
Economically disadvantaged students	35,263	26,431	75.0
Migratory students	129	99	76.7
Male	30,033	23,800	79.2
Female	28,951	24,047	83.1
Comments:			

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	59,008	51,067	86.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	479	440	91.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	750	698	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20,386	16,138	79.2
Hispanic	2,739	2,206	80.5
White, non-Hispanic	34,400	31,360	91.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,220	3,005	48.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,650	1,130	68.5
Economically disadvantaged students	35,278	28,679	81.3
Migratory students	125	95	76.0
Male	30,060	24,961	83.0
Female	28,948	26,106	90.2
Comments:			

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No Science Assessment given in this grade.			

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	58,118	47,980	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	472	411	87.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	679	630	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	19,979	14,749	73.8
Hispanic	2,491	1,878	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	34,302	30,132	87.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,117	2,705	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,301	766	58.9
Economically disadvantaged students	34,266	26,195	76.4
Migratory students	113	83	73.5
Male	29,605	23,715	80.1
Female	28,513	24,265	85.1
Comments:			

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	58,106	49,672	85.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	469	415	88.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	654	611	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	19,974	15,496	77.6
Hispanic	2,467	1,945	78.8
White, non-Hispanic	34,349	31,034	90.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,126	2,745	44.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,254	761	60.7
Economically disadvantaged students	34,248	27,276	79.6
Migratory students	112	79	70.5
Male	29,607	24,317	82.1
Female	28,499	25,355	89.0
Comments:			

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	57,146	44,133	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	458	377	82.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	672	597	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	19,662	12,428	63.2
Hispanic	2,443	1,683	68.9
White, non-Hispanic	33,720	28,886	85.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,007	2,546	42.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,275	617	48.4
Economically disadvantaged students	33,563	23,042	68.7
Migratory students	113	77	68.1
Male	29,097	22,145	76.1
Female	28,049	21,988	78.4
Comments:			

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	57,460	44,156	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	529	462	87.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	699	645	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,105	12,804	63.7
Hispanic	2,277	1,661	72.9
White, non-Hispanic	33,693	28,454	84.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,125	2,115	34.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,099	626	57.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,583	23,007	68.5
Migratory students	99	73	73.7
Male	29,532	22,243	75.3
Female	27,928	21,913	78.5
Comments:			

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	57,516	49,469	86.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	528	485	91.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	685	639	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,136	15,689	77.9
Hispanic	2,263	1,822	80.5
White, non-Hispanic	33,750	30,692	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,152	2,808	45.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,069	668	62.5
Economically disadvantaged students	33,625	26,993	80.3
Migratory students	97	84	86.6
Male	29,560	24,248	82.0
Female	27,956	25,221	90.2
Comments:			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No Science Assessment given in this grade.			

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	57,065	39,255	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	473	356	75.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	699	639	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	19,962	11,079	55.5
Hispanic	2,136	1,323	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	33,670	25,766	76.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,893	1,548	26.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	915	339	37.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32,219	18,598	57.7
Migratory students	94	61	64.9
Male	29,338	18,932	64.5
Female	27,727	20,323	73.3
Comments:			

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	57,100	47,292	82.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	474	409	86.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	691	623	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,002	14,686	73.4
Hispanic	2,111	1,595	75.6
White, non-Hispanic	33,696	29,872	88.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,899	2,322	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	883	400	45.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,252	24,354	75.5
Migratory students	91	58	63.7
Male	29,377	22,819	77.7
Female	27,723	24,473	88.3
Comments:			

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	55,685	38,310	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	457	351	76.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	685	588	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	19,440	10,466	53.8
Hispanic	2,088	1,243	59.5
White, non-Hispanic	32,895	25,578	77.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,679	1,806	31.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	885	268	30.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31,277	17,977	57.5
Migratory students	88	49	55.7
Male	28,583	18,900	66.1
Female	27,102	19,410	71.6
Comments:			

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	55,929	43,959	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	509	424	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	676	641	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	19,593	12,867	65.7
Hispanic	2,001	1,529	76.4
White, non-Hispanic	33,041	28,401	86.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,096	2,338	38.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	879	523	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	31,124	21,712	69.8
Migratory students	104	69	66.3
Male	28,841	21,928	76.0
Female	27,088	22,031	81.3
Comments:			

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	55,882	41,048	73.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	508	411	80.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	669	577	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	19,583	11,777	60.1
Hispanic	1,980	1,319	66.6
White, non-Hispanic	33,029	26,869	81.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,109	1,595	26.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	848	289	34.1
Economically disadvantaged students	31,081	19,633	63.2
Migratory students	101	60	59.4
Male	28,813	19,623	68.1
Female	27,069	21,425	79.1
Comments:			

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No Science test given in this grade			

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	48,892	41,137	84.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	491	433	88.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	549	524	95.4
Black, non-Hispanic	16,887	12,672	75.0
Hispanic	1,332	1,122	84.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,563	26,324	89.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,787	1,794	37.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	558	403	72.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,434	17,129	76.4
Migratory students	50	44	88.0
Male	24,270	20,039	82.6
Female	24,622	21,098	85.7
Comments:			

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	48,863	39,912	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	488	415	85.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	547	465	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	16,889	12,226	72.4
Hispanic	1,327	957	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	29,542	25,790	87.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,781	1,588	33.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	564	214	37.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,424	16,288	72.6
Migratory students	49	31	63.3
Male	24,256	19,108	78.8
Female	24,607	20,804	84.5
Comments:			

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	48,615	45,315	93.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	488	471	96.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	545	522	95.8
Black, non-Hispanic	16,744	14,637	87.4
Hispanic	1,324	1,187	89.7
White, non-Hispanic	29,444	28,433	96.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,727	3,161	66.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	561	423	75.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22,266	19,782	88.8
Migratory students	50	48	96.0
Male	24,119	22,381	92.8
Female	24,496	22,934	93.6
Comments: Migrant Data collected via a more accurate and complete collection method and additional training provided to ensure more accurate reporting.			

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	1,375	1,035	75.3
Districts	132	81	61.4
Comments: Alabama evaluated 1376 public schools, including 866 Title I schools for the 2009-10 status. Statewide, 122 school have been identified for SI. 56 were Title I schools, a 29% decrease from the previous year.			

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	887	680	76.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	842	644	76.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	45	36	80.0
Comments: 56 schools total were in improvement			

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
129	77	59.7
Comments: number of districts that received Title I funds and made AYP - 126 minus 3 = 123 (not all districts take Title I funds)		

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	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	5
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments: Replace all or most - three schools; Extend the school day - three; Replacement members of staff - 2; Replace the principal - 1; Restructuring the internal organ - 5 schools; Appoint an outside expert - 1. Blank cells should be value of zero.	

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	3
Comments: Hire Turnaround specialist to direct school reform in three schools. Blank cells should be value of zero.	

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.

Hire Turnaround specialist to direct school reform in three schools.
--

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's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- 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.

No districts in Alabama were identified for improvement in 2009-2010.

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: No districts in Alabama were identified for improvement or corrective action in 2009-2010.	

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	3	3
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	09/07/09
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 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		
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		
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		
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		
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		
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		
Comments: Those files are still waiting to be loaded. I called them yesterday and asked what they were going to do if these files were still not loaded and they said they would have to handle it on a case by case basis. As of now they still haven't been loaded. This chart was complete and was showing data on December 10th. It is blank today December 17th.		

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	
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 2009-1	9
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	
Comments: 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 - 12 schools. 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 - 4 schools	

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.
6 = Combo 1	Combo of strategies 1 through 5 provided the framework for customized technical assistance given to local school improvement specialists by Peers (master teachers assigned to particular multi-year schls) during the year. Activities: correcting instruction for curriculum alignment and pacing for optimum student achievement; empowering teachers to use more standards-based instruction; Implement Positive Behavior Support (model).	56	24	32	D	LEAs had capacity to support improvement strategies in schools that needed another year of making AYP; Reduction (29% from previous yr) to only 56 schools for SY09-10. Increase student engagement and improved culture.
5	Several districts hired parent facilitators or beefed up their programs on parental involvement; Graduation or Student Advocate Coaches were hired; Strategic Teaching across core disciplines required; Small groups for intense acceleration of skills; Technology helped with student engagement.	13	7	6	D	More parents were involved in the improvement process. More students made AYP on state assessments. Schools in "delay" status were able to successfully progress out of the improvement arena.
	The State Support Team participated with LEA leadership Teams in regular professional learning opportunities during the year. State improvement specialists called Peers were strategically placed in					Teachers finished the year more capable of deciphering data to determine school needs. "I do, we do, you do" is only effective if schools staff can replicate the process

4	the neediest schools based on multiple years in SI; PD was provided by state-level School Improvement Administrators and Specialists trained in latest strategies by outside experts.	56	24	32	D	for themselves without continuous outside coaching; In the majority of schools, frequent classroom walkthroughs and follow-up coaching sessions by school curriculum leaders helped keep faculties "on point."
1	The state school improvement administrators and specialists provided customized technical assistance according to identified needs in the different LEAs. LEAs also received the benefit of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and its staff because a large number of high schools adopted High Schools That Work (HSTW).	24	23	1	D	High schools faculties adopting evidence-based strategies were more likely to have a positive trend in graduation rates. Overall, student achievement improved across the board as shown by the reduction of the number of schools in improvement. Students responded well to advisee-advisor programs and graduation rates increased; 1003(g) grantees emphasized literacy across the curriculum, "No Zero" policies, Advisor-Advisee Programs; increased instructional rigor; providing of 9th Grade Academies.
1	Answers included above	56	0	0	D	Answers included above
1	Answers included above	56	0	0	D	Answers included above
1	Answers included above	56	0	0	D	Answers included above
1	Answers included above	56	0	0	D	Answers included above

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.

Alabama shared effective school improvement strategies through regional School Assistance Meetings (SAMs) held quarterly throughout the entire state. Topics such as Increasing the Graduation Rate with the new governors' formula, Choosing and Using a School Leadership Team, and How to Reach Each Student Through Data were presented. Many superintendents and central office personnel attended with principals and School Improvement Specialists.

The State also hosted an annual MEGA conference to which all LEAs were invited. Specific "best practices" were shared for elementary, middle, and high school teachers, principals, and central office staff. Presenters for the conference included highly recognized School Improvement researchers and practitioners along with members of the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE).

The Federal Programs Section of the ALSDE hosted monthly Wednesday Webinars. Several of these webinars specifically addressed school reform as well as district and school best practices. Although presented by the Federal Programs Section, LEAs were encouraged to have all central office staff participate.

Alabama has a long history with the Southern Region Education Board (SREB). The State collaborated with SREB in 7 high poverty, lowest performing high schools through High Schools That Work. These schools were invited to the High Schools That Work conference and also had access to a number of high quality professional development sessions throughout the school year. SREB encouraged district leadership to attend their sessions and introduce the concepts and strategies to other schools within their district.

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: The state reserved 4%: \$8,216,911; 95% flow-thru \$7,806,065; 5% admin - \$410,846.

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 ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts 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.

Evaluation: Alabama contracted with the Southeast Regional Educational Lab (SERVE) at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to provide an outside perspective on progress at 1003(g) middle and high schools. SERVE tracked data through the following measurable out including for example: the number and percentage of students scoring proficient in reading/language arts as measured by state assessments for grades 3-8; the number of middle schools whose students make improvement by participating in the Adolescent Literacy Project; and in high schools, traced gains in students passing the Alabama High School Graduation exam thus increasing the graduation rate.

Technical Assistance: Regional school improvement coaches were supported so they could more completely serve the eight 1003 (g) middle schools and the seven high schools in all endeavors related to the grant, for example, ensuring that the school's Continuous Improvement Plan folded seamlessly into the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) school improvement plan (High Schools That Work). All staff associated with this fund were afforded multiple opportunities to attend in-depth, high-quality, consultant-led learning sessions focusing on a "train-the-trainer" model to build their capacity to support low-performing schools. Throughout the FY 2009-2010 school year, Regional School Improvement Coaches served 29 LEAS with a total of 50 schools carrying the school improvement status with activities such as conducting school walk-throughs, leading a district-wide roundtable, utilizing School Improvement Specialists and using benchmark assessments.

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.

The State Support Team was composed of Regional School Improvement Coaches and Peer Mentors who assisted schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring through the support of state allocated At-Risk funds with a little supplementation from Title I. These support services included building capacity for school improvement processes at the district local education agency (LEA) level. Training was provided to central office personnel on: Preparing the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP); Implementing school CIPs; Raising Graduation Rate strategies; including student mentoring and credit recovery; Interventions for Non-Mastery; Preparing for High Stakes Testing; and Planning for Change.

Peer Mentor (master teachers) assignments were prioritized to insure that multiple year school improvement schools with the greatest needs received campus-level job-embedded training that included: using multiple measures of data and creating functional CIPs; using longitudinal data to identify achievement gaps in instructional programs; using pacing guides and identifying essential objectives for instruction; developing common assessments that are correlated to pacing guides; planning instruction for needs of non-mastery students; and employing CIPs for reflection and projection. In addition, sessions on school improvement strategies were held at the statewide MEGA Conference in Mobile this past summer. Some of the same topics were addressed in multiple sessions.

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	36,082
Applied to transfer	780
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	624
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	\$

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	8

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	21,886
Applied for supplemental educational services	4,414
Received supplemental educational services	3,185
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	\$
Comments: Did not populate in cell Dollars spent on SES \$3,227,244.44	

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	219,809	211,527	96.2	8,282	3.8
All elementary classes	118,945	116,474	97.9	2,471	2.1
All secondary classes	100,864	95,053	94.2	5,811	5.8

Original Entries are in error due to complexity of method used in assigning relationship between Certification Endorsements to subject categories in some HQT categories resulting in failure in new automated system to denote some HQT Teachers as HQT. Original numbers included non-core classes which caused an increase in class count and also reduced HQT percentages. This has been corrected. Tables X063 and X064 have been resubmitted to EDEN. ATTACHING TABLES TO CSPR PART I VERIFICATION TABLE

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.

CORRECTED DATA FOR 1.5.3

Category School Type Number of Core Academic Classes Number of Core Academic Classes Taught By HQT Teacher Percent of Core Academic Classes Taught By HQT Teacher SchoolYr
 Elementary High Poverty 29,018 28345 97.68 2009-2010
 Elementary Low Poverty 31,659 31120 98.30 2009-2010

Secondary High Poverty 11,694 10,406 88.99 2009-2010
 Secondary Low Poverty 43,301 41,456 95.74 2009-2010

Category Number of Core Academic Classes Number of Core Academic Classes Taught By HQT Teacher Percent of Core Academic Classes Taught By HQT Teacher Number of Core Academic Classes Taught By Non- HQT Teacher Percent of Core Academic Classes Taught By NON-HQT Teacher SchoolYr
 All Elementary Classes 118,945 116,474 97.92 2,471 2.08 2009-2010
 All Secondary Classes 100,864 95,053 94.24 5,811 5.76 2009-2010

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.

DEPARTMENTALIZED FOR ALL GRADES

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	85.4
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	14.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.5
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)	83.6
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	15.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.5
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	28,905	28,150	97.4
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	31,485	30,946	98.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	11,609	10,296	88.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	43,076	41,248	95.8
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	85.2	49.2
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students receiving Free or Reduced priced meals	
Secondary schools	72.3	41.8
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students receiving Free or Reduced priced meals	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- 1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/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
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No</u>	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	20,674
---	--------

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.	18,633

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
Spanish; Castilian	17,179
Korean	520
Vietnamese	426
Arabic	384
Chinese	289

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	19,670
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	71
Total	19,741
Comments: This population is very transient some students move prior to testing others move during testing. We make every effort to test all students and will continue to make every effort to test all students.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	9,298
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	64.4
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	17,455
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	45
Total	17,500
Comments: The number tested is 94% of our total Title III LEP students due to transient nature of our migrant/LEP population. This population is very transient some students move prior to testing others move during testing. We make every effort to test all students and will continue to make every effort to test all students.	
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.	4,397

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	10,507	80.5	7,826	42.00
Attained proficiency	8,382	48.0	2,050	11.00
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.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

Language(s)
N/A

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

Language(s)

N/A

Comments: N/A

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
2,690	2,313	5,003
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
3,958	3,586	90.6	372
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
3,959	3,775	95.4	184
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
1,544	1,330	86.1	214
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	52
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	49
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	52
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	52
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	49
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	2
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

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: Each Consortia stands alone as an individual district.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	Yes
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the 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
3,647	1,053	7

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,165
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	267

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.

In order to get a more accurate number, we added the question about number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs, into our Web Portal so that it would include all certified teachers working with students and not those with a scheduled class as we did before.

* 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	50	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	40	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	38	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	48	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	30	
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	51	11,318
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	44	358
PD provided to principals	50	669
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	505
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	43	1,471
PD provided to community based organization personnel	15	144
Total	252	14,465

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Accountability Issues for ELs(AMAOs)-1,Biliteracy-1,EL Learners with Special Needs-1,Family Literacy-1,Learning to read as an EL-1, Response to Instruction(Rtl) for ELs-1,Rtl Tiers and EL-1, Scaffolding in Content Areas-1, Separating Difference from Disability-1, Sheltered Instruction-1, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol(SIOP)for classroom teachers-1, SIOP Strategies-1, Special Education and the ESL Student-1, STI Data for the ACCESS for ELLs-1, Test Modifications for ELs-1, TransAct Training-1, Writing Language Objectives for EL students-1.

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
7/2/09	10/1/09	16

Comments: The fiscal year of the State of Alabama is October 1 through September 30. The # of Days/\$\$ Distribution is calculated from the time funds are available (October 1) and the first distribution to an LEA.

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.

Date required to make the allocations to the LEA is available before the funds are made available to LEA's. Consequently, it is a short time before they request reimbursement for expenditures. The first request for FY 2010 Title III funds was made in November 2009.

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: Zero (0) schools in the 132 school districts in the state of Alabama have been reported as Persistently Dangerous Schools. EDEN did not populate this cell.	

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	86.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	91.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	82.1
Hispanic	81.9
White, non-Hispanic	89.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	61.3
Limited English proficient	72.0
Economically disadvantaged	85.1
Migratory students	92.0
Male	84.4
Female	89.4
Comments:.	

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	<3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	<3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3%
Black, non-Hispanic	<3%
Hispanic	<3%
White, non-Hispanic	<3%
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	<3%
Limited English proficient	<3%
Economically disadvantaged	<3%
Migratory students	<3%
Male	<3%
Female	<3%
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	59	59
LEAs with subgrants	73	73
Total	132	132
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<10
K	47	1,522
1	51	1,625
2	49	1,519
3	58	1,534
4	52	1,450
5	47	1,317
6	34	1,230
7	36	1,040
8	38	1,006
9	47	960
10	46	841
11	34	607
12	43	600
Ungraded	N<10	31
Total	592	15,695

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	23	1,299
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	539	13,410
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<10	499
Hotels/Motels	28	487
Total	592	15,695

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)	338
K	1,223
1	1,333
2	1,259
3	1,252
4	1,197
5	1,113
6	1,065
7	897
8	898
9	850
10	759
11	540
12	535
Ungraded	49
Total	13,308
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	544
Migratory children/youth	277
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,384
Limited English proficient students	565
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	34
Expedited evaluations	10
Staff professional development and awareness	35
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	33
Transportation	27
Early childhood programs	18
Assistance with participation in school programs	34
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	29
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	25
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	27
Coordination between schools and agencies	30
Counseling	29
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	18
Clothing to meet a school requirement	46
School supplies	56
Referral to other programs and services	24
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	20
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	14
School Selection	8
Transportation	13
School records	16
Immunizations	15
Other medical records	8
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	1,194	951
4	1,181	957
5	1,091	866
6	959	762
7	812	607
8	1,055	711
High School	371	264
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	1,198	873
4	1,179	877
5	1,086	846
6	954	644
7	805	468
8	1,061	772
High School	371	283
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)	411
K	208
1	234
2	198
3	179
4	159
5	142
6	139
7	127
8	130
9	116
10	114
11	79
12	76
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	137
Total	2,453
Comments: No warnings to explain. :)	

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.

Alabama didn't have an increase/decrease for Category 1 greater than 10% for this reporting period.

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)	117
K	54
1	50
2	42
3	31
4	33
5	18
6	17
7	N<10
8	17
9	36
10	37
11	17
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	477

Comments: No warnings to explain. :)

Increases in Pre-K, K, and Grades 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and OSY (Kdgn. doubled)

09-10, 477

08-09, 369= 106 more students

We did not receive a yellow warning on this page originally. In response to your question concerning the increase of 106 students state wide during the summer session our response would be in part to the very migrant nature of the student population. There were more student at those grade levels and/or more migrant students in the state during the summer session. More students took advantage of the summer sessions.

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.

Alabama didn't an increase/decrease in Category 2 greater than 10% for this reporting period.

No warnings to explain. :)

Increases in Pre-K, K, and Grades 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and OSY (Kdgn. doubled)

09-10, 477

08-09, 369= 106 more students

We did not receive a yellow warning on this page originally. In response to your question concerning the increase of 106 students state wide during the summer session our response would be in part to the very migrant nature of the student population. There were more student at those grade levels and/or more migrant students in the state during the summer session. More students took advantage of the summer sessions.

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 state of Alabama used the MS2000 data system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period. MIS2000 was also used for the last reporting period.

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.

When did Alabama adopt the national COE? Was their COE reviewed by ED? Alabama began using the "National" COE in the Fall of the 09-010 school year after receiving it from OME in the Spring of 09. Alabama was monitored in April of the 09-010 school year and the COE was reviewed at that time. No negative comments or further instructions were made regarding any information collected on the COE in use.

Alabama is divided into 3 regions for the purpose of data collection and quality control. Each region has a coordinator who visits each program as part of the state's quality control plan and collects/reviews each new Certificate of Eligibility with the local staff. During this same visit any withdrawals and/or school transfers are collected. The regional coordinator takes the information back to home base where the new data and updates are entered. This is done on a monthly or as needed basis.

The COE document upon completion contains the following data:

School District Name: The school district name is entered at the top of the COE.

COE Identification Number: The COE ID # is generated by the MIS2000 system when the COE is entered by one of the three regional coordinators.

Withdrawal Date: When the child listed on a COE withdraws from the local school system, the MEP staff enters the withdrawal date on the original COE. The regional coordinator then enters the withdrawal date on the MIS2000 database. The regional coordinators contact the local MEP staff for updates regarding migrant students who have withdrawn or changed schools.

Worker Information: Worker's First, Middle Initial, Last Name, Gender, and Current Address of Worker/Family

Child Data: First, Middle Initial, Last Name, an MIS2000 assigned ID number (which stays with the student upon all enrollments in Alabama), Ethnicity, Gender, Date of Birth, Date of Birth Verification, Birthplace, School Name, Grade, Enroll Date, Enroll Type, and Interrupted Education (Yes or No)

Eligibility Data: The school district the child(ren)/family moved to and from, the qualifying arrival date and residency date of the children/family, information on whether the child moved with or to join the worker or on his/her own as an emancipated youth, the relationship of the child to the worker, checks to identify whether the worker came to obtain or seek, temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing employment, the name of the qualifying activity, and the reason the work is considered temporary.

Parent/Guardian Consent: The parent/guardian signs and dates the COE, after FERPA has been explained to him/her, authorizing the school district and the State Educational Agency to release, transfer, and/or receive the child's education and health records to/from other school districts, educational agencies, and other pertinent agencies.

Eligibility Data Certification: The recruiter signs the COE certifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible for MEP services based upon the information provided. The signature attests that "to the best of the recruiter's knowledge, the information is true, reliable, and valid. The recruiter then submits the completed COE to the local MEP designee for a signature certifying the same statement as the recruiter.

Summer School/Intersession: The local MEP staffs provide a description and the dates of the migrant summer programs. The local MEP staff submits a list of all students who attend the migrant summer program. A school history line is entered on the MIS2000 with the dates of summer attendance for each child who attends. The local MEP staffs also provide a list of the services the students receive during the summer programs. These services are entered on the MIS2000 data base.

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.

How frequently does the MEP Committee review and return COEs to Regional/local recruiters? The MEP committee meets monthly and the COEs are returned to the Regional/local recruiters following each monthly meeting.

The regional coordinators regularly enter and update all data. The MIS2000 system technicians build reports which organize the data needed for annual reporting. The two reports used are: Table C-7 12 Month Count by District (Category 1) and Table C-7 Summer Count by District (Category 2). These are both unduplicated counts. The tables are run "by district" in order to have further checks for accuracy. The MIS2000 is used for migrant data entry in Alabama.

There are three regional migrant coordinators who enter migrant data for their assigned regions of the state and are the only persons who enter and update migrant data on the MIS2000 data system. The regional coordinators enter data weekly.

The state of Alabama requires each school system to have Employment/Agricultural surveys completed on new students who enter their systems. The local MEP recruiters for systems who have funded programs and the state recruiter for those systems without funded programs use these "Employment Survey" forms to find potential migrant students. The families are visited face-to-face to determine eligibility. If the family is eligible based on MEP guidelines, a COE is completed with the family and children information required on the COE. Eligibility Data Verification and Certification: The recruiter completes the COE and

signs the COE certifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible for MEP services based upon the information provided. The signature attests that "to the best of the recruiter's knowledge, the information is true, reliable, and valid." The recruiter checks the COE for completeness and then submits the completed COE to the local MEP designee for a check and completeness and a signature certifying the same statement as the recruiter. After the local MEP designee has signed and dated the COE, it is submitted for approval to the state MEP committee. The state MEP committee checks the COE for completeness, and eligibility. If the COE is complete and accurate and the

eligibility is approved, the regional coordinator enters the COE into the MIS2000 system and the COE is returned to the local system for filing. If the COE is not approved due to lack of completeness or eligibility questions or issues, it is returned to the system for more information or corrections. If the COE is not approved due to eligibility issues, it is returned to the local MEP with the reason. The yearly verification process to determine that the children/family is still in the area and in the school system combines a combination of the following methods:

- Use of face-to-face visits with the family by the local migrant staff
- Verifying that the student is still enrolled in school by use of school records especially by checking the state student tracking system used by all the schools STI which contains enrollment and withdrawal records.

COE Eligibility Data Verification and Certification: The recruiter completes the COE and signs the COE certifying that the child(ren) listed on the COE are eligible for MEP services based upon the information provided. The signature attests that "to the best of the recruiter's knowledge, the information is true, reliable, and valid". The recruiter then submits the completed COE to the local MEP designee for a signature certifying the same statement as the recruiter. After the local MEP designee has signed and dated the COE, it is submitted for approval to the state MEP committee. The state MEP committee, made up of the state director, the state recruiter, and all three of the regional coordinators, checks the COE completeness and eligibility. If the COE is complete and the eligibility is approved, the regional coordinator enters the COE into the MIS2000 system and the COE is returned to the local system for filing. If the COE is not approved due to lack of completeness or eligibility questions or issues, it is returned to the local system for more information or corrections. If the COE is not approved due to eligibility issues, it is returned to the local MEP with the reason.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alabama's Category 2 data IS NOT collected differently from the Category 1 count.

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.

How does the State define "supplemental services" in the summer session? How does it ensure that only services that meet the Department's definition (in the instructions of the CSPR) are those included in the child count?
Alabama defines services as those educational activities that directly benefit a migrant child by addressing the needs of a migrant child consistent with the comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan. The activities should be grounded in scientifically based research and enable the migrant program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of Alabama's performance standards. The definition is the same during both the regular school year and summer session. We do not change our definition. The school systems are required to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment annually on all programs. For a school system to receive migrant funding they must report their needs assessment findings in their eGap applications along with the scientifically research based programs that will be used. Each system is also required to outline their service delivery plan along with the activities that they plan to use to increase migrant academic achievement in their application. The school systems applications are review by the SDE to make sure that they are providing academically focused instruction. The SDE also monitors each one of the systems providing summer migrant sessions with onsite visits by our state regional coordinators, the state migrant coordinator and or state migrant director. During the onsite visits educational activities are observed.

Alabama uses Management Services for Education Data (MSeD) for our data collection. The data system we use is called the MIS2000 system.

The purpose of MIS2000 is to collect all data relevant to the MEP in Alabama from the schools and districts that serve the students and to compile it into a single database at the state level so that unduplicated counts can be produced for the CSPR. MIS2000 has all data from all sites throughout the state. The system has a search procedure, the potential to duplicate reports, and the merge student procedure to work together to purge duplicate student records. A single unduplicated count for the state is produced from a database that itself should be free of duplicates after using the three tools mentioned above. Producing unduplicated counts for districts or regions requires that each student be assigned to a single district or region for purposes of compiling a count for each.

The MIS2000 system will determine the student's eligibility by using the following criteria: The child count will produce a number and list of students who have an enroll date, funding date, qualifying arrival date, or withdrawal date between the start date and end date desired.

The yearly verification process to determine that the children/family is still in the area and in the school system combines the following methods: 1) Use of fact to face visits with the family by the local migrant staff and 2) verifying that the student is still enrolled in school by use of the school records, especially by checking the state student tracking system (STI) which is used by all the schools in the state. The STI contains enrollment and withdrawal records for all students in the state. The STI and MIS2000 list of migrants is verified in the fall and in the spring to ensure that only eligible migrant students are coded as migrant on the STI database.

The following is the procedure that MS2000 uses to determine if a student is Category 1

Category 1 - Students must meet each of the following criteria to be counted on this report.

- 1.) EnrollDate FundingDate LQMDate ResDate or WithdrawDate is between the StartDate and EndDate (Student has activity during the date range.)
- 2.) LQM3Date is greater than the StartDate (Student's LQM was within 3 years of the StartDate.)
- 3.) TwentySecondBDay is greater than the StartDate (Student turns 22 after the StartDate.)
- 4.) ThirdBDay is less than the EndDate (Student turns 3 before the EndDate.)

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MS2000 data system used the following criteria when determining a students category 2 status- Category 2 - Students must meet each of the following to be counted on this report.

- 1.) EnrollDate Funding Date LQMDate ResDate or WithdrawDate is between the StartDate and EndDate (Student has activity during the date range.)
- 2.) LQM3Date is greater than the StartDate (Student's LQM was within 3 years of the Startdate.)
- 3.) TwentySecondBDay is greater than the StartDate (Student turns 22 after the StartDate.)
- 4.) ThirdBDay is less than the EndDate (Student turns 3 before the EndDate.)
- 5.) EnrollType is S or SU (Student's enrollment has a Summer enrollment type.)

For students in Category 2 the local MEP staff provides a report each semester and at the end of the summer with a list of all supplemental

services that were provided for each migrant child. The regional coordinator enters these services into the supplemental services tab on MIS2000. The "Supplemental Services" report can be printed for each system indicating the services received by a child for any time frame.

Also, to prevent duplicate records, the regional coordinator searches MIS2000 for any student with a new COE before entering the student/family data. The student can be searched by last name, first name, date of birth, or parent's name before entering. If the student is on the MIS2000, he/she will be entered keeping the same identification number as previously assigned. A "duplicate" student report can be generated on MIS2000 which will list any potential duplicate students. If the regional coordinator, after consulting with the local MEP staff, determines that a student has previously been entered and is entered again with a new MIS2000 assigned identification number, the two

records are merged into one record maintaining the originally assigned number.

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.

District recruiters are trained by the state and then receive updated training on a regular basis. The local recruiter has the first responsibility to complete a COE accurately after determining that a family may be eligible. The district coordinator reviews the COE for completeness, and then it is submitted to the regional coordinator who reviews the COE to verify tentative eligibility. Official eligibility is decided by the State MEP Committee. If there are questions, more information is requested, and the COE is reviewed by the State Migrant Specialist in consultation with all regional coordinators. COEs submitted by the state recruiters are reviewed for approval at this time as well. The regional coordinators randomly select a percentage (5%) of new COEs to conduct re-interviews for quality control annually. They report their findings to the state director.

Alabama's COE is a standard COE that is used state wide.

Training is provided for local MEP recruiters annually at the state level and at the local level as need, when new recruiters are hired. The state of Alabama requires that all recruiters receive training before beginning recruitment. The State of Alabama has adopted a recruitment tool entitled "The Recruiter's Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students." Each recruiter has a copy of the manual and has been trained on its contents. Any new recruiters are provided a copy of the manual and training on its use.

Some of the Topics covered at training sessions include the following: Qualities of a good recruiter, Employment Surveys collection procedures and use, how to interview, filling out the COE, keeping records, determining priority for services, types of services that can be provided to the migrant students, recruiting safety, quality control/re-interviewing issues, and qualifying agricultural and fishing activities. The recruiter signs the COE certifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible for MEP services based upon the information provided. The signature attests that "to the best of the recruiter's knowledge, the information is true, reliable, and valid. The recruiter then submits the completed COE to the district MEP designee for a signature certifying the same statement as the recruiter. After the local MEP designee has signed and dated the COE, it is submitted for approval by the state MEP committee. The state recruiter, the three regional migrant coordinators, and the state migrant director make up the approval committee. The state MEP committee checks the COE for completeness and eligibility. If the COE is approved, the regional coordinator enters the COE into the MIS2000 database and the COE is returned to the appropriate MEP personnel at the local level for filing.

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.

How does the State check attendance for summer session students? Each LEA maintains a list of migrant students who attend and participate in summer sessions. The LEA then provides a list of summer school participants to the Regional Migrant Coordinator for entry into the MIS2000. The Coordinator enters the summer enrollment dates and the summer withdrawal dates for the students who participate in the summer school programs. A migrant "District Verification" for the summer session can be printed by the LEA with a list of the summer session enrollees.

How did the state determine that 5% of its new COEs provided a substantial sample for re-interviewing? When does the state expect to conduct independent re-interviews? Alabama began using 5% as their guide after the nationwide reinterviewing process. Last year (09-10) we re-interviewed 25 families out of 402 new COEs. Of those we only had one family not qualify. The year before (08-09) there were 337 COEs eligible for review and 25 families were re-interviewed. Again we only had one family not qualify. Now that we have received the official adopted guidance from OME along with the training materials on reinterviewing we will be moving to make changes in the way Alabama re-interviews our new migrant families. We anticipate conducting the independent re-interviews during the summer and fall of this year.

The re-interview process is explained below: (First paragraph is response to CSPR I 09-10 question)

Our quality control plan requires that we re-interview 5% of our new COEs for the year. For this time frame (09-10) there were 402 new COEs for consideration. Of the 402 new COEs 25 were selected for re-interviewing. (Which was more than the 5% required) Of the 25 re-interview only 1 was found to be ineligible.

One of the Regional Migrant Coordinators puts the numbers 1-20 on pieces of paper and draws out the numbers one at the time. For Example is # 8 is the first number drawn then 8 is the first number on the list of Random numbers used to choose families to be re-interviewed. This process is continued until all the numbers are drawn and a random list of twenty numbers is completed. Each RMC runs a report from MIS2000 called "Verification of Student Data". This is a list of families enrolled in the Migrant Program since the last re-interview was conducted. The families on this list are numbered 1-20. If there are more than 20 families on the list, the numbering starts over 1-20 until all the families have a number.

The number 1-20 are used because 5% (1 out of 20) of all families enrolled in the migrant program during the year are re-interviewed. The RMC will count the number of families on the list and take 5% of that number to determine the number of families to be re-interviewed. For instance, if there are 56 families on the Verification list then 3 families are chosen to be re-interviewed. The list of random numbers is then used to select the families to be re-interviewed. For examples is # 8 is the first number on the list then any family that has a number 8 beside their name is chosen for to be re-interviewed. If a family has moved, the next random number is chosen until the RMC has chosen 5% of the families. Sometimes families cannot be located and another family must be chosen. These are chosen in same manner as a family who has moved.

After the families are chosen, a copy of the COE is made so that the RMC can verify the information on the COE during the re-interview.

The questions for the re-interview process were developed by the State Migrant Contract Team which consists of the 3 regional migrant coordinators, the state migrant recruiter and the state migrant coordinator. The team looked at several documents from other states as well as what law requires and developed our questionnaire utilizing these sources.

Re-interviewing is usually done during the spring. An exception is made when a system has a large number of students enrolling during a short time such as during the summer. In several of our system the children come during the summer and leave before the first of the year; therefore, re-interviewing in these systems must be done during the summer months or there is no quality control for them.

The RMC for each area of the state conducts the re-interviews with the help of the state migrant recruiter who translates for the RMC. These people were trained to conduct re-interviews during the first re-interview process. Re-interviews are conducted face-to-face. The telephone is used only in cases when face-to-face interviews cannot be conducted, i.e. when the parents work during the day and cannot be reached until night.

After the re-interviews are completed, the team looks at the results and makes a final decision as to the eligibility of the family. The results are filed in the office of the RMC and a report is sent to the state coordinator. If a family is found in-eligible, then they are removed from the MIS2000 data base, immediately after the eligibility determination if made by the committee.

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.

Each Regional Migrant Coordinator is responsible for the accuracy of the data she enters. The MIS2000 provides "Snap Reports" to check for accuracy of data entered. The coordinators check the MIS2000 reports as data is entered on a report to check for accuracy of data entry.

Some of the reports checked on MIS2000 include the following:

District Verifications which list each student in each system

End of Eligibility reports to determine when a student is not longer eligible for the migrant program

Verifying COE data to check for accuracy of COE information entered

Supplemental Services list to indicate which students are receiving services

Student Performance report to check for accuracy of LEP status, testing information, special education, graduation status, dropout status

Immunization report to determine which students do not have immunization dates on the database

Priority for Service reports to print list of Priority I and II students.

The coordinators check the MIS2000 reports as data is entered on a report to check for accuracy. Some reports are printed monthly, others by school terms as needed.

The Regional Migrant Coordinators (RMC) prints a District Verification of eligible students for the beginning of the school year, at the beginning of term 2, and at the beginning of the summer. The District Verification is checked to ensure that no student is on the list whose eligibility has ended before each of the three terms. The end of eligibility can be verified by printing an End of Eligibility Report from MIS2000. Also, migrant students are withdrawn on MIS2000 when they reach the age of 22. The MIS2000 has a "red" date indicating end of eligibility which assists with data entry and withdrawals. As the RMC visits the district staff on a monthly basis, the information is collected on any students who have withdrawn from the system based upon information from STI (state tracking system).

Regional migrant coordinators provide a list of eligible students to the local staff at the beginning of the school year. The local staff assists with verifying that the students are still in the district and that they are listed in the correct grade levels and at the correct schools. The RMC will utilize the MIS2000 District Verification of eligible students and the STI list of students who are enrolled in school at the 20 day SDE count and again before testing in the spring to ensure that only students who are eligible are listed on the MIS2000 District Verification and on the STI.

The yearly verification process to determine that the children/family is still in the area and in the school system combines the following methods: 1) Use of face-to-face visits with the family by the local migrant staff and verifying that the student is still enrolled in school by the use of school records, especially by checking the state student tracking system which is used by all the schools in the state. The STI system contains enrollment and withdrawal records for all students in the state. The STI and MIS2000 list of migrant students is verifying in the fall and in the spring to ensure that only eligible migrant students are coded as migrant on the STI database.

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.

Alabama runs reports "by district and unduplicated" to look at individual sites to uncover any irregularities. We verify the criteria used in building the reports which give us our child counts.

Discrepancies in the reports are corrected if and when errors are found. For example, if a date of birth is wrong, it is corrected on the MIS2000 database. If a grade level is wrong, it is corrected on the MIS2000 database. Sometimes these errors are found and corrections are made after a report is submitted. All efforts are made to enter the data correctly. For example, a report can be generated on MIS2000 to indicate the End of Eligibility so that students can be withdrawn appropriately when the EOE occurs. Also, there is a report to indicate which students turn age 22; so that they can be withdrawn on the day he/she turns age 22.

For the purposes checking the data for and running of the Child Count 1 and 2 reports to be reported to ED that person would be the State Department of Education Migrant Coordinator and for the running of reports on a daily basis for the purpose of day to day monitoring of the student data base that would be the Regional Migrant Coordinators.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alabama already has in place a series of steps for reviewing new COEs and re-interviewing families which have been recently recruited. There is a committee established (made up of 3 regional coordinators, one state recruiter, and the State Migrant Specialist) to

review difficult eligibility and either approve or disapprove the COE's in question. This gives support to our local recruiters. We also plan to conduct further state-wide random re-interviewing.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alabama is confident that you child counts are accurate. We trust that the processes and checks we have in place and have described above are accurate to the best of our ability