

**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  
CALIFORNIA**



**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
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part I, 2009-10	<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: California Department of Education		
Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Justin Lane		
Telephone: 916-319-0495		
Fax: 916-319-0971		
<a href="mailto:jlane@cde.ca.gov">e-mail: jlane@cde.ca.gov</a>		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Deb Sigman		
Friday, April 29, 2011, 1:27:31 PM		
Signature	Date	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2009-10**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT****STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to the content standards have been made. However, California is planning for the implementation of the core standards in the future.
--

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.

The CDE is continuing to develop the California Modified Assessments (CMA). This standards-based assessment is administered to pupils with an IEP who meet the SBE approved participation criteria.

In November 2006, a pilot test was conducted for the CMA in grades four, five, and six to provide information about the population of pupils to be tested. Blueprints for the CMA for grades three through five in ELA and mathematics were adopted by the SBE in 2007. The CMA was administered for the first time in 2008 to eligible pupils in grades three through five. A CMA writing test was developed and was administered to eligible pupils in grades four and seven in 2009. Additionally, assessments for grades six through eight in ELA, grades six and seven in mathematics were administered for the first time in 2009. The Algebra assessment in Algebra I and ELA for grade nine was administered in Spring 2010. Standard settings for the new CMA assessments administered in 2010 will be adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in January 2011. Blueprints have been developed and adopted by the SBE for CMA Geometry and Grade 10-11 ELA to be administered in Spring 2011.

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)	41.0
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	59.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	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
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	3,335,980		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	23,217		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	383,845		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	229,983		>97
Hispanic	1,696,927		>97
White, non-Hispanic	882,520		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	352,667	341,211	96.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	744,803		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	1,937,982		>97
Migratory students	55,213		>97
Male	1,699,763		>97
Female	1,613,204		>97

**Comments:** "EDEN file N081, which populates table 1.2.1 in the CSPR, contains a field which requires information regarding the "full academic year" status of each student record. EDEN will not accept a record with missing information in this field. As a result, student records with missing information regarding their "full academic year" status cannot be included in the table."

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	184,561	53.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,166	8.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	96,458	28.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	32,115	9.4
Total	342,300	

**Comments:** EDEN file N081, which populates table 1.2.1 in the CSPR, contains a field which requires information regarding the "full academic year" status of each student record. EDEN will not accept a record with missing information in this field. As a result, student records with missing information regarding their "full academic year" status cannot be included in the table.

EDEN file N093, which populates table 1.2.2 in the CSPR, does not require the "full academic year" status of each student record. Therefore, records that could not be included in the file N081 are included in file N093 making it impossible for these two tables to match.

Since file N081 is collecting information about student participation in the state assessments it is unclear as to why the "full academic year" status is required. California would like to work with EDEN's staff to resolve this issue for 2010-11 C:SPR reporting





### 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	3,338,402		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	23,219		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	383,846		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	229,986		>97
Hispanic	1,696,963		>97
White, non-Hispanic	882,547		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	352,678	339,541	96.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	744,824		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	1,938,037		>97
Migratory students	55,215		>97
Male	1,699,799		>97
Female	1,613,239		>97

**Comments:** "EDEN file N081, which populates table 1.2.3 in the CSPR, contains a field which requires information regarding the "full academic year" status of each student record. EDEN will not accept a record with missing information in this field. As a result, student records with missing information regarding their "full academic year" status cannot be included in the table."

### 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	166,373	48.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,913	6.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	120,144	35.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	32,187	9.4
Total	340,617	

**Comments:** EDEN file N081, which populates table 1.2.3 in the CSPR, contains a field which requires information regarding the "full academic year" status of each student record. EDEN will not accept a record with missing information in this field. As a result, student records with missing information regarding their "full academic year" status cannot be included in the table.

EDEN file N093, which populates table 1.2.4 in the CSPR, does not require the "full academic year" status of each student record. Therefore, records that could not be included in the file N081 are included in file N093 making it impossible for these two tables to match. Since file N081 is collecting information about student participation in the state assessments it is unclear as to why the "full academic year" status is required. California would like to work with EDEN's staff to resolve this issue for 2010-11 CSPR reporting.

The SBE set eligibility criteria for taking the CMA. The CDE does not limit the number of students who may take the CMA as long as the student meets the SBE eligibility criteria and has an IEP indicating that the CMA is the appropriate test for the student to take. However, CDE does apply the required cap on the number of students who may be counted as proficient for accountability purposes.

### 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	1,439,370		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,248	9,867	96.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	168,520		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	101,477	97,537	96.1
Hispanic	724,265		>97
White, non-Hispanic	395,625		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	149,204	141,692	95.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	269,008		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	816,123		>97
Migratory students	22,823		>97
Male	738,462		>97
Female	700,713		>97

**Comments:** "EDEN file N081, which populates table 1.2.5 in the CSPR, contains a field which requires information regarding the "full academic year" status of each student record. Eden will not accept a record with missing information in this field. As a result, student records with missing information regarding their "full academic year" status cannot be included in the table."

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	75,295	51.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,367	6.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	44,045	30.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	17,511	12.0
Total	146,218	

**Comments:** EDEN file N081, which populates table 1.2.5 in the CSPR, contains a field which requires information regarding the "full academic year" status of each student record. Eden will not accept a record with missing information in this field. As a result, student records with missing information regarding their "full academic year" status cannot be included in the table.

EDEN file N093, which populates table 1.2.6 in the CSPR, does not require the "full academic year" status of each student record. Therefore, records that could not be included in the file N081 are included in file N093 making it impossible for these two tables to match.

Since file N081 is collecting information about student participation in the state assessments it is unclear as to why the "full academic year" status is required. California would like to work with EDEN's staff to resolve this issue for 2010-11 CSPR reporting.

**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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	460,075	296,756	64.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,075	1,753	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	51,891	43,215	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	30,467	14,913	48.9
Hispanic	243,300	136,246	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	117,142	90,414	77.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	47,274	21,147	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	157,896	80,442	50.9
Economically disadvantaged students	282,432	156,062	55.3
Migratory students	8,126	3,944	48.5
Male	235,755	153,792	65.2
Female	224,243	142,928	63.7

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	460,033	198,199	43.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,074	1,106	36.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	51,872	32,986	63.6
Black, non-Hispanic	30,483	9,921	32.5
Hispanic	243,262	74,496	30.6
White, non-Hispanic	117,143	71,655	61.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46,911	14,636	31.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	157,811	34,755	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	282,419	86,038	30.5
Migratory students	8,104	1,590	19.6
Male	235,651	95,750	40.6
Female	224,302	102,424	45.7

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 3.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	466,447	312,787	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,113	1,790	57.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,803	46,988	85.7
Black, non-Hispanic	31,451	16,381	52.1
Hispanic	243,823	144,640	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	120,582	93,758	77.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	51,319	23,586	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	133,911	67,563	50.5
Economically disadvantaged students	283,451	165,614	58.4
Migratory students	8,128	4,368	53.7
Male	239,000	158,440	66.3
Female	227,413	154,326	67.9

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	466,540	286,813	61.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,118	1,701	54.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,792	43,521	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	31,478	15,919	50.6
Hispanic	243,872	122,172	50.1
White, non-Hispanic	120,596	94,181	78.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	51,174	21,151	41.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	133,890	45,243	33.8
Economically disadvantaged students	283,514	140,557	49.6
Migratory students	8,132	2,956	36.4
Male	239,020	139,581	58.4
Female	227,487	147,212	64.7

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

## 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			
<b>Comments:</b> California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 4.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	461,910	277,161	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,233	1,529	47.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,182	42,338	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	32,164	14,564	45.3
Hispanic	239,550	123,939	51.7
White, non-Hispanic	122,335	86,638	70.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	51,863	21,227	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	109,934	42,339	38.5
Economically disadvantaged students	279,532	142,263	50.9
Migratory students	7,971	3,553	44.6
Male	236,996	139,836	59.0
Female	224,885	137,313	61.1

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	461,916	265,105	57.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,234	1,605	49.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,173	39,558	75.8
Black, non-Hispanic	32,174	14,809	46.0
Hispanic	239,509	109,391	45.7
White, non-Hispanic	122,379	91,054	74.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	51,661	19,518	37.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	109,828	25,924	23.6
Economically disadvantaged students	279,484	125,672	45.0
Migratory students	7,969	2,524	31.7
Male	236,962	127,291	53.7
Female	224,925	137,800	61.3

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

## 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	461,188	256,074	55.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,226	1,621	50.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,133	38,644	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	32,059	13,339	41.6
Hispanic	239,216	102,353	42.8
White, non-Hispanic	122,135	91,590	75.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	51,560	21,985	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	109,721	26,186	23.9
Economically disadvantaged students	279,041	118,363	42.4
Migratory students	7,955	2,142	26.9
Male	236,550	134,871	57.0
Female	224,610	121,193	54.0
<b>Comments:</b> The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	462,809	237,297	51.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,298	1,340	40.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	53,066	39,729	74.9
Black, non-Hispanic	32,282	11,024	34.1
Hispanic	238,406	96,656	40.5
White, non-Hispanic	123,332	81,266	65.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	50,456	16,184	32.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	91,458	21,366	23.4
Economically disadvantaged students	274,835	109,947	40.0
Migratory students	7,915	2,771	35.0
Male	237,146	122,121	51.5
Female	225,626	115,157	51.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	462,995	250,256	54.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,306	1,521	46.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	53,080	39,176	73.8
Black, non-Hispanic	32,317	13,116	40.6
Hispanic	238,442	99,749	41.8
White, non-Hispanic	123,415	88,500	71.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	50,363	16,019	31.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	91,425	15,810	17.3
Economically disadvantaged students	274,918	112,637	41.0
Migratory students	7,916	2,438	30.8
Male	237,253	120,372	50.7
Female	225,704	129,867	57.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 6.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	465,704	232,515	49.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,260	1,341	41.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,473	41,322	74.5
Black, non-Hispanic	32,345	10,608	32.8
Hispanic	237,306	92,628	39.0
White, non-Hispanic	125,091	79,667	63.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	48,831	13,431	27.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	86,856	18,150	20.9
Economically disadvantaged students	270,309	104,759	38.8
Migratory students	7,866	2,805	35.7
Male	238,533	119,007	49.9
Female	227,118	113,493	50.0

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	465,895	251,289	53.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,264	1,596	48.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,472	41,161	74.2
Black, non-Hispanic	32,378	13,088	40.4
Hispanic	237,364	96,984	40.9
White, non-Hispanic	125,178	90,387	72.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	48,724	14,582	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	86,794	12,115	14.0
Economically disadvantaged students	270,358	108,544	40.1
Migratory students	7,868	2,404	30.6
Male	238,600	119,028	49.9
Female	227,243	132,241	58.2

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

## 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 7.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	469,692	199,671	42.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,320	1,133	34.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,217	39,043	69.5
Black, non-Hispanic	32,297	8,482	26.3
Hispanic	236,638	74,219	31.4
White, non-Hispanic	128,999	70,925	55.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46,968	8,700	18.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	80,423	13,929	17.3
Economically disadvantaged students	268,574	85,048	31.7
Migratory students	7,610	2,356	31.0
Male	239,881	99,884	41.6
Female	229,754	99,778	43.4

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	473,603	249,859	52.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,365	1,573	46.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,424	41,400	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	32,730	12,828	39.2
Hispanic	238,483	95,126	39.9
White, non-Hispanic	130,183	91,195	70.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	47,935	13,061	27.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	81,155	10,268	12.7
Economically disadvantaged students	270,941	106,983	39.5
Migratory students	7,655	2,339	30.6
Male	242,280	117,413	48.5
Female	231,263	132,430	57.3

**Comments:** The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	471,834	274,913	58.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,336	1,698	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,363	44,450	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	32,469	13,605	41.9
Hispanic	237,651	110,488	46.5
White, non-Hispanic	129,698	96,614	74.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	47,594	15,385	32.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	80,916	18,207	22.5
Economically disadvantaged students	269,882	124,703	46.2
Migratory students	7,649	2,945	38.5
Male	241,175	144,304	59.8
Female	230,602	130,595	56.6
<b>Comments:</b> The CDE implemented the new race and ethnicity data collection requirements, as required by the October 19, 2007, guidance, in the fall of 2009. The new data collection methodology and reporting requirements had a significant impact on the American Indian or Alaska Native category. Many of the students previously included in that category were moved into the "Two or More Races" category.			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	482,370	256,964	53.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,384	1,620	47.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,843	45,344	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	33,711	11,321	33.6
Hispanic	235,561	96,747	41.1
White, non-Hispanic	132,806	91,372	68.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44,500	8,193	18.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	74,628	14,583	19.5
Economically disadvantaged students	252,167	104,467	41.4
Migratory students	7,099	2,603	36.7
Male	246,521	133,983	54.3
Female	235,778	122,951	52.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	480,016	258,544	53.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,359	1,710	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,793	41,811	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	33,359	13,247	39.7
Hispanic	234,215	95,668	40.8
White, non-Hispanic	132,354	94,901	71.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	42,773	8,515	19.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	74,082	7,879	10.6
Economically disadvantaged students	250,664	100,364	40.0
Migratory students	7,065	2,094	29.6
Male	245,328	120,003	48.9
Female	234,618	138,512	59.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	475,914	217,832	45.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,305	1,410	42.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	58,428	38,560	66.0
Black, non-Hispanic	33,009	9,899	30.0
Hispanic	231,983	75,495	32.5
White, non-Hispanic	135,867	85,600	63.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	42,538	8,606	20.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	71,732	7,611	10.6
Economically disadvantaged students	249,248	81,068	32.5
Migratory students	6,928	1,788	25.8
Male	243,064	114,403	47.1
Female	232,781	103,404	44.4

**Comments:** Please note: This section cannot be certified until the ED is able to get this table to populate. Ticket #155282

There are several reasons that contributed to the significant decrease, more than 20 percentage points, from the previous year for Migratory students who completed the assessment in Science:

- 1)The current political climate surrounding immigration prompted many migrant families not to move as often as they did in previous years therefore the numbers of eligible families has decreased nationwide and also in California
- 2)Demographic data may not be accurately captured by LEAs in the header of the California Standards Tests (CSTs) indicating Migrant students.
- 3)Many migrant students are English Language Learners and may not have the adequate language skills to be tested on the Science portion of the SCT.

**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	9,855	3,774	38.3
Districts	1,021	251	24.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	6,090	1,794	29.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4,281	1,014	23.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,809	780	43.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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
956	197	20.6
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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))<sup>1</sup>
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	200
Extension of the school year or school day	20
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	33
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	18
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	86
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	103
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	22
Reopening the school as a public charter school	2
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	43
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	273
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2009-10, two hundred seventy-three schools in Year 2 restructuring engaged in three hundred eight other major restructuring actions involving one or more of the elements listed below:

- Ninety-two schools Implemented Professional Learning Communities.
- Sixty-seven schools implemented or continued the use of district and school level teams including District-School Liaison Teams (DSLTL), District Assessment and Intervention Teams (DAIT) and School Leadership Teams (SLT).
- Forty-three schools implemented standards-based core curriculum and research-based intervention programs supported by professional development for core academic teachers. This will be overseen by district level committees.
- Fifty-four schools implemented targeted Professional Development in standards-based curriculum, scientifically-based intervention models such as Rtl and Read 180, and other instructional strategies.
- Twenty-five schools modified the master schedule to increase student learning time and allow for professional development activities.
- Nine schools continued with Quality Education Investment Act restructuring activities including the reduction of class sizes, professional development for effective teaching and implementation of research-based intervention strategies
- Ten schools replaced the school principal and other instructional staff.
- Eight schools increased district oversight and Title I reservations while decreasing Title I funding to year 4 and 5 schools to provide greater control of Title I activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

California has taken a triage approach to district level intervention in local educational agencies (LEAs) subject to intervention under Title I, Part A. In this context, LEAs include districts and county offices of education. Beginning in 2003, the state Legislature appropriated a portion of the Title I, Part A set-aside for LEAs at-risk of School Improvement, in School Improvement, or in School Improvement Corrective Action to use to improve student achievement. Given the recession, only LEAs in Corrective Action Improvement are funded in 2010-2011.

As documented elsewhere in the California State Performance Report, LEAs must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in order to avoid Improvement status. AYP is aggregated at the LEA level and disaggregated by numerically significant student groups. Typically, California LEAs advance in Improvement status based upon the performance of English learners and students with disabilities.

LEAs at risk of School Improvement: California Education Code (EC) Section 52055.57(a) requires the State Educational Agency (SEA) to identify and notice LEAs that are at risk of being identified for Improvement within two years, providing them with research-based criteria to conduct a voluntary self assessment. Available state assessment tools include: 1) the Academic Program Survey, (APS) which is designed to help a school analyze the extent to which it is providing a coherent instructional program to support improved student achievement; 2) the District Assistance Survey, which is designed to guide LEAs and their technical assistance providers in supporting school level Improvement around the areas assessed in the APS; 3) the English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment, which serves as a district level tool for LEAs to analyze outcomes and program services for English learners (ELs); and 4) the Inventory of Services and Support for Students with Disabilities, which is designed to gain a deeper understanding of the learning needs of students with disabilities. These assessments are available at the California Department of Education State Program Assessment Tools Web page at:

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. LEAs are provided with technical assistance on the use of these tools through webinars and webcasts, and through the Regional System of District and School Support (RSDSS), which is one component of the Statewide System of School Support.

LEAs identified for School Improvement Years 1, 2, 3, or 3+ in 2010-11 must adhere to specific accountability requirements. These requirements are available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/leapiyrs.asp>. Additional information and resources are also available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/pilearesources.asp>.

LEAs in School Improvement Year 1: When an LEA is identified for improvement, it must notify parents; convene a district level team of teachers, parents, and school and district administrators to analyze achievement data for all students; conduct a comprehensive needs assessments using the tools identified above; and write an Addendum to their LEA Plan identifying key action steps for improvement. LEAs are provided with technical assistance in the development and implementation of LEA Plans through CDE webinars and webcasts, ongoing telephone support with CDE staff, and RSDSS support. Districts are directed to reserve no less than 10% of their Title I, Part A allocation for high quality professional development, which is an ongoing requirement in any year that the LEA remains in School Improvement. Additional information about Year 1 improvements requirements is available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/pirequirement.asp>.

LEAs in School Improvement Year 2: LEAs that failed to meet all AYP targets in 2010-11 advance to Year 2. LEAs must notify parents that the LEA remains in School Improvement, reserve at least ten percent of the LEA Title I allocation for professional development, and continue implementing their LEA Plan Addendum that was developed in Year 1. LEAs continue to receive technical assistance via the Statewide System of School Support.

LEAs in School Improvement Year 3: An LEA that advances to School Improvement Year 3 becomes identified for Corrective Action and is subject to additional Title I accountability requirements. In addition to parent notification and professional development set-asides, the LEA is subject to one or more sanctions as required by federal law. In addition, each LEA receives fiscal resources from the federal set-aside as specified in California Education Code Section 52055.57 (c).

As of September, 2010, 234 LEAs have advanced to School Improvement Year 3 at the district or county office level. One hundred seventy three have been assigned Corrective Action 6 to "institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including participation in professional development for relevant staff, with special attention to the needs of high priority students." High priority students have been defined in California as ELs, students with disabilities, and students not meeting grade-level standards. Three LEAs have also been assigned trustees. Sixty one LEAs will be assigned a corrective action in January 2011. Technical assistance for each of these LEAs is differentiated based upon an index of the pervasiveness and severity of academic achievement problems. See California Education Code (EC) Section 512055.57(c).

Selected LEAs with low index values are assigned to work with District Assistance and Intervention Teams (DAITs), whose responsibilities include to:

- Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment
- Make recommendations for improvement (based on the results of the needs assessment)
- Assist the LEA in revising its LEA Plans to document steps to implement the assigned corrective action
- Support the LEA in implementing the LEA Plan
- Monitor LEA implementation of the LEA Plan

LEAs must adopt the DAIT's recommendations unless exempted by the SBE, and inform all parents of the assigned corrective action.

State law provides that LEAs continue to implement their approved LEA Plan. The SEA may review the performance and progress of any LEA in corrective action at any time. In addition, any LEA that fails to exit School Improvement within three years must appear before the SBE, who may, upon hearing testimony from the LEA, assign an alternative corrective action. We anticipate that this action will occur for some number of LEAs in PI Year 3 Corrective Action Cohort 1 during the 2010-2011 fiscal year.





**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	173
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	3
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
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	16	5
Schools	109	15
<b>Comments:</b> Please note: The appeal information has not yet been incorporated into the AYP and PI data files. We anticipate the files will be updated on March 21, 2011, after the due date for completing Part I of the CSPR. As a result, the overall AYP determination and/or PI status of schools and districts may change after the appeal results have been incorporated into the data files.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	03/11/11
---	----------

### 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 <b>mathematics</b> 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	1,151,016	1,175,921
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	506,242	480,911
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	44.0	40.9
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> 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	1,151,541	1,178,512
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	460,021	441,596
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	39.9	37.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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 <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	320
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> 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 <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	2,403
<b>Comments:</b>	



**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 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
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>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</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		5	0	2	A	
2		47	5	4	A	
6 = Combo 1	This combo consisted of strategies 1 and 2	348	30	30	A	

**Comments:** A total of 115 LEAs, with 405 schools, were SIG funded. However, at the time of the report window, strategies from two LEAs, with a total of four schools, could not be reported, because their data was changing or not available.

**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.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to 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.

The California Department of Education (CDE) provided technical assistance to local educational agencies through Webinars, conference calls, and posting frequently asked questions and guidance to our CDE Web page. The CDE provides on-going technical assistance via e-mail and individual telephone calls. The CDE also conducted a statewide meeting providing information and guidance on School Improvement Grant strategies and requirements.

**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.

Title I schools supported by State-funded programs are implementing the nine Essential Program Components endorsed by the State Board of Education (SBE):

- 1) Instructional Program: Standards-aligned English-language arts and mathematics textbooks and SBE adopted Pre-Algebra and Algebra I textbooks
- 2) Student access to high school standards-aligned core courses (master schedule and pacing schedule)
- 3) Principals' Instructional Leadership Training
- 4) Teachers' Professional Development Opportunities
- 5) Student Achievement Monitoring System
- 6) Ongoing instructional assistance and support
- 7) Teacher/Department and subject matter collaboration
- 8) Intervention programs for students performing below grade level standards
- 9) Fiscal support

**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.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	2,020,795
Applied to transfer	19,570
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	96,502
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	\$ 37,735,525

**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	222

**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:**

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	1,220,131
Applied for supplemental educational services	181,713
Received supplemental educational services	134,382
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 202,524,979
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	678,737	648,099	95.5	30,638	4.5
All elementary classes	143,331	140,207	97.8	3,124	2.2
All secondary classes	535,406	507,892	94.9	27,514	5.1

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

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

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

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a

departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

California counts self-contained elementary classes as one class.

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	10.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	89.9
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)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	25.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	75.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	103,135	100,280	97.2
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	40,112	39,845	99.3
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	345,120	324,061	93.9
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	189,653	183,217	96.6
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	35.2	14.7
Poverty metric used	Federal Free or Reduced Lunch Program was used. The data is based on school level elementary data. For this section of poverty quartiles, Charter schools are included. For reporting poverty in this section, only high and low poverty were required.	
Secondary schools	34.6	15.3
Poverty metric used	Federal Free or Reduced Lunch Program was used. The data is based on school level secondary data. For this section of poverty quartiles, Charter schools are included. For reporting poverty in this section, only high and low poverty were required.	

#### 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.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/LanguageInstructionEducationalPrograms.pdf>.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Arabic, Armenian, Cantonese, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Arabic, Armenian, Cantonese, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Cantonese, Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Cantonese, Filipino, Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Khmer, Mandarin, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian, Vietnamese
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	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In California, Dual Language programs are also known as Two-Way Immersion. We have entered the same information on both lines.

Other language instruction educational programs include: departmentalized English Language Development (ELD); before/after school ELD intervention; Accelerated Language Academy; Independent Study Program; Scholastic Read 180 California Program; partial foreign language programs; and the Rosetta Stone program. An English language mainstream program is also being used for students who demonstrate English proficiency but have not met all criteria for reclassification. A newcomer program is used for students who have been in the U.S. for less than one year. Students also receive English Learner Intensive Intervention ELD instruction. Language enrichment programs are also used.

In an effort to meet the needs of English learner students, local educational agencies in California have instituted a variety of education programs to provide instruction in English as a second language (ESL), each of which appears to be as different as the students themselves. However, regardless of the type of program, the minimal goal of an ESL program is to provide each student with the English skills necessary to function successfully in an academic setting.

**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	1,467,989
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	LEP 1,441,637

<b>Comments:</b>
------------------

**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	1,242,285
Vietnamese	36,540
Chinese	33,660
Tagalog	21,211
Hmong	16,437

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	1,509,480
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	26,787
Total	1,536,267
<p><b>Comments:</b> The count in CSPR section 1.6.3.1.1 includes those students who took the annual assessment and the initial assessment. The initial test is give continuously throughout the years and not all students who take the initial assessment are classified as LEP students. However, in section 1.6.2.1, we use the fall enrollment count, in the California Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), to report on the number of LEP students. These two sections do not match up because data for 1.6.3.1.1 is collected continuously throughout the year, while data in 1.6.2.1 is a point in time collection.</p>	

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

Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	# 525,926
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	33.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,543,810
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	1,543,810
<b>Comments:</b> This table reflects all students tested. However, based on the results of the assessment, LEAs may determine that some students may no longer need services. As a result there will be more students tested than students receiving services, which is the number reflected in table 1.6.2.2.	
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).	
	<b>#</b>
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.	278,495

**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	721,294	57.0	667,357	53.10
Attained proficiency	461,911	29.9		

**Comments:** There are two cohorts with two targets for the "Attained Proficiency" category (AMAO 2):

Less than five years cohort:

The total number of ELs who have been in language instruction educational programs for less than 5 years (sum of cohort2\_5l) = 964,495

The target for less than 5 years cohort is 17.4%

The target number of LEAs attained proficiency is  $964,495 \times 17.4\% = 167,822$

Five years or more cohort:

The total number of ELs who have been in language instruction educational programs for 5 years or more (sum of cohort2\_5m) = 543,969

The target for 5 years or more cohort is 41.3%

The target number of LEAs attained proficiency is  $543,969 \times 41.3\% = 224,659$



**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)

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

**Language(s)**

**Comments:** California does not offer a native language assessment in

**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
146,970	116,857	263,827
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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
224,815	136,971	60.9	87,844
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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
224,858	136,884	60.9	87,974
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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
89,590	53,632	59.9	35,958
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	649
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	96
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	507
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	408
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	145
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	96
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	81
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	135
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	190

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:** Title III Accountability results are prepared for each direct funded LEA or consortium funded by Title III. The results for consortium members are aggregated up to the consortium level.

The 135 subgrantees implementing an improvement plan were identified in 2008-09 based on not meeting AMAOs in 2007-08 and 2008-09. The improvement plans for the 81 subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10) will be due on January 13, 2011.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

**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
217,005		187

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.

For fiscal year 2009-10, the California Department of Education did not gather data on the number of immigrant students who (1) participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), and (2) did not receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under sections 3114(a) and 3115(a). This data will be collected starting in fiscal year 2010-11 via the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

**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) ù The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course ù (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.	203,770
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	12,055

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.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) in California reported that almost all their teachers are authorized to teach English learner (EL) students. In very rare cases there were LEAs who have one or two teachers who are not authorized to teach EL students. These teachers are not currently assigned any EL Students. LEAs also reported that these teachers (not authorized) are in process of completing their credentialing to instruct EI students. Some LEAs indicated that an EL teaching credential is required as a condition of employment.

Some LEAs reported that they will have no need for additional authorized (certified/licensed) teachers in the next five years. The most common reason was declining enrollment of EL students. This is a common trend in California.

The budget crisis in California has drastically reduced the state funding level of LEAs. As a result, LEAs are forced to lay off teachers, including EL teachers. While classroom teachers are being reduced, class sizes are increasing to cover the shortfall. However, there were a few LEAs that indicated that they will need to hire a limited number of teachers to replace retirees.

\* 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	641	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	605	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	574	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	537	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	561	
Other (Explain in comment box)	158	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	620	111,670
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	601	90,522
PD provided to principals	617	7,832
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	549	5,174
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	478	13,137
PD provided to community based organization personnel	190	18,480
Total	646	246,815

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Per the requirement of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Part A, Section 3115(c)(2), local educational agencies provided professional development (PD) training related to the teaching and learning of English learner students on a wide range of activities and/or topics. Other PD activities and/or topics include the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) of Kansas University; Inquiry by Design for middle school students; Strategic and Intensive Mathematics Initiative (SIMI); BayCES equity training for administrators and teacher leaders; SDAIE Trainer of Trainers for District Coaches; Advanced Via Individual Determination (AVID) training; Response to Intervention (RTI); Systematic Intervention: Guided Language Acquisition and Design (GLAD); Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) for English Learners; Imagine Learning for English Learners; English language development materials uses; Professional Learning Communities; Framework for Understanding Poverty; focused walk-through training for administrators; Step Up to Writing; Backward Mapping; Stages of Language Acquisition; Differentiating Instructions for English Learners; Elements of Effective Instructions; cultural proficiency leadership skills and character education; Differentiated Instruction and Project-based Learning; individual action plans for English learner students in need; Thinking Maps—Path to Proficiency; Sheltered Instructional Protocol (SIOP); Singapore Math; Critical Friends Groups; English learner Achieve Systematic English Language Development training; Four Blocks Framework for Balanced Literacy; Bilingual Pedagogy; Balanced Literacy training; Gradual Release of Responsibility; Constructing Meaning for Long-Term English Learners; Sheltered Content Instruction Implementation; scaffolding and critical reading strategies for heritage language learners; strategies for Improving involvement of language minority parents; analyzing English learner data and English learner identification; Gradual Release of Responsibility; Spanish to English Bilingual Transfer; community outreach programs; English language development curriculum adoption "Keystone" training; Differentiation Strategies—Computer-Assisted Technology; Digital Edge Training (Computer/Interwrite Pad); instructional approaches and relationship building to assist in the closing of the achievement gap; Cognitive Coaching for Administrators; Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE); CAFE Project INSPIRE; Cultural Responsive Instructional Teaching Strategies; Step Up to Writing and High Point/Avenues training; and systematic approach to English language development.

### 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
7/13/09	1/28/10	199
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Beginning with the 2010-11 fiscal year, the California Department of Education has implemented a completely online application system (with established deadlines) as well as a federal cash management procedure for all sub-grantees, both of which expedite and streamline the funding process. In the first year of implementation, these measures reduced distribution time by 60 days.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	62.0
Limited English proficient	71.1
Economically disadvantaged	75.4
Migratory students	77.0
Male	75.1
Female	82.2
<p><b>Comments:</b> CDE submitted graduation rate (EDEN file N041) using the 7 race/ethnicity categories; however, this section of the CSPR cannot be populated using the 7 race/ethnicity categories. Per the data submitted to EDEN, the graduation rates for 2008-09 is as follows:                      American Indian or Alaska Native, 71.8                      Asian, 90.8                      Black, 63.0                      Hispanic, 72.7                      Two or more races, 70.5                      Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 76.1                      White, 87.0</p>	

**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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	5.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	10.4
Hispanic	7.0
White, non-Hispanic	3.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7.5
Limited English proficient	<3
Economically disadvantaged	6.5
Migratory students	4.6
Male	6.5
Female	4.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

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

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1,229	1,229
LEAs with subgrants	228	228
Total	1,457	1,457
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
	Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	579
K	6,364	10,681
1	5,947	10,206
2	5,604	10,510
3	5,448	10,244
4	5,249	10,715
5	4,814	10,369
6	4,810	10,492
7	4,514	9,516
8	4,450	9,343
9	4,020	9,917
10	3,490	8,866
11	3,315	7,678
12	3,010	7,086
Ungraded	74	1,181
Total	61,688	132,108

**Comments:** The data for CSPR 1.9.1.1 show a considerable decrease in the number of homeless children and youths enrolled in school for the SY 2009-10. The main cause for this decrease is the data reporting procedures and sources to collect homeless data has fully transitioned to a new data system. CDE is currently working to improve the data quality in the homeless data collected in this system for SY 2010-11.

**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	6,972	15,688
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	49,948	103,114
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	2,254	6,214
Hotels/Motels	2,514	7,092
Total	61,688	132,108

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,048
K	25,338
1	24,466
2	24,633
3	24,215
4	24,661
5	23,667
6	23,472
7	21,497
8	21,390
9	21,273
10	19,733
11	17,038
12	15,447
Ungraded	3,397
Total	301,275
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	9,149
Migratory children/youth	3,936
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,690
Limited English proficient students	56,901
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	162
Expedited evaluations	77
Staff professional development and awareness	191
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	185
Transportation	205
Early childhood programs	88
Assistance with participation in school programs	177
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	138
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	156
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	166
Coordination between schools and agencies	203
Counseling	145
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	119
Clothing to meet a school requirement	184
School supplies	224
Referral to other programs and services	195
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	142
Other (optional – in comment box below)	42
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.

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	83
School Selection	50
Transportation	127
School records	76
Immunizations	66
Other medical records	38
Other Barriers – in comment box below	85

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*.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	8,775	2,411
4	8,639	3,869
5	7,635	3,131
6	7,947	2,911
7	7,418	2,669
8	5,790	1,918
High School	5,940	2,170
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	8,761	4,444
4	8,629	4,600
5	7,614	3,660
6	7,938	2,785
7	7,423	2,562
8	5,700	1,543
High School	5,981	2,214
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	18,735
K	10,339
1	8,991
2	11,062
3	10,320
4	10,364
5	10,039
6	9,790
7	9,596
8	9,819
9	9,082
10	9,207
11	9,240
12	12,115
Ungraded	283
Out-of-school	27,019
Total	176,001

**Comments:** "There was a 13% decrease in the 12 month Count of eligible migrant children. Some factors contributing to the decrease in the number of eligible migrant children are:

- Tighter border security making it more difficult for some families to cross into Mexico and back.
- The economy has fewer jobs for new workers and new workers are less likely to migrate
- Workers seem to be spending more time piecing together jobs in one location and not moving - perhaps due to the anti immigration atmosphere in certain areas
- Another factor is that CDE is making better eligibility determinations."

**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.

There was a 13% decrease in the 12 month Count of eligible migrant children. Some factors contributing to the decrease in the number of eligible migrant children are:

- Tighter border security making it more difficult for some families to cross into Mexico and back.
- The economy has fewer jobs for new workers and new workers are less likely to migrate
- Workers seem to be spending more time piecing together jobs in one location and not moving - perhaps due to the anti immigration atmosphere in certain areas
- Another factor is that CDE is making better eligibility determinations.

**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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,152
K	4,830
1	5,809
2	6,124
3	6,209
4	6,151
5	5,823
6	5,548
7	5,659
8	5,166
9	4,885
10	5,072
11	4,893
12	2,426
Ungraded	110
Out-of-school	4,516
Total	84,373
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

There was a 14% decrease in the Category 2 Child Count. Some factors contributing to the decrease in the number of eligible migrant children are:

- Tighter border security making it more difficult for some families to cross into Mexico and back.
- The economy has fewer jobs for new workers and new workers are less likely to migrate
- Workers seem to be spending more time piecing together jobs in one location and not moving - perhaps due to the anti immigration atmosphere in certain areas
- Another factor is that CDE is making better eligibility determinations
- California continues to target services to Priority for Service students

**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.

Migrant Education Regional Offices entered Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar (software program) by TROMIK. The Migrant Education Regions then used COEstar to transmit records electronically to the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) server at WestEd. The same systems were used to generate the Category 1 and 2 child counts 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.

The OME Program Officer approved the California COE. The OME Program Officer confirmed that the COE was in compliance with the following national COE standards:

- Required data elements which the State organized according to State preference
- Required data sections were maintained whole and unaltered
- State required information is collected in the available space

All of the COE elements on that COE are entered into COEstar. COEstar presents a facsimile of the COE so no fields are missing.

a. Data Collected: The regional offices entered Certificates of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar. COEstar assigns a regional "COEstar number to track records. The COEDATA table contains Certificate of Eligibility (COE) information; the I.D. tables contains student information such as school of enrollment birth date and grade level; the SH tables contains school history information such as date of enrollment, withdrawal date and the school year and the SUPPROGS table contains support services information. All data are collected from the local Migrant Regional Office. To differentiate between a summer/intersession service and a regular term service a summer service is coded with an "S" and an intersession service is coded as "I".

b. Activities Conducted to Collect the Data: The data collection begins at the Regional level or in the case of directly funded districts at the school district level. Recruiters assigned to the Migrant Regional Offices are community based. District recruiters can be school based or they can perform community based identification and recruitment. All recruiters were trained to conduct interviews applying the revised eligibility criteria as described in the 34 CFR 200 that went into effect August 28, 2008. A state-developed and OME approved COE is used to record the migrant family's eligibility for the MEP. Community based recruiters search out eligible migrant families through a variety of means.

A recruiter may choose to use the telephone to make appointments for an interview, pre-screen, or to make general notes, but the eligibility interview itself may not be conducted over the telephone. It must be conducted face-to-face. Once an interview has been conducted, it is permissible to telephone the family for additional information or for clarification of facts.

A school based recruiter might be assigned by the region to work in a single school, several schools or several school districts, depending on the region's organizational structure. The school based recruiter works closely with school administrations to participate in any pre-registration activities before the start of a school term. The recruiter establishes a working relationship with principals, counselors, school secretaries, school nurses, ESL teachers, bus drivers and teaching assistants to promote the migrant program and seek assistance in identifying potentially eligible families.

A community based recruiter search for migrant families where the families live, work, shop, worship and at community-based organizations or service agencies where they might seek services or assistance. These recruiters also distribute MEP informational flyers and brochures in key locations.

School based recruiters that are assigned to cover more than one school site use tablet PCs as their primary tool, with paper COEs as a backup. Recruiters assigned to a single site use PC workstations since they do not need the portability of a Tablet PC.

Recruiters use a paper COE or an electronic version using the Tablet PC. All COE data including signatures are captured on the electronic form just as they are on the paper form. In the conventional method using the paper COE, when the form has been completed by the recruiter, the reviewer assess the form for accuracy and completeness and signs the COE. The COE is submitted to the data entry section for input into the local database (COEstar). Before the COE information is permanently applied to the local database a final quality review is conducted.

The summer/intersession enrollment information is collected at the end of each project. The project administrator at the school district or region submits the list of participants or project roster to the designated person at the region (this can be a program coordinator, supervisor or data entry person, depending on the size and organizational structure of the region). This person reviews the information to ensure that it contains the needed information; student name, student id, project name, project code, project start and end dates, and whether it is a summer or an intersession service. After the roster is reviewed and approved, it is given to the data entry operator for entry into COEstar. The region generates pre-formatted project enrollment forms that contain all the required fields for each district and the region and distribute them at the start of the summer or intersession period. The projects can use their own forms, provided they contain the required information.

COEstar is a star based system with multiple tablets reporting to a "host system" that serves to consolidate the data at the region level. Data is transferred from the tablet to the host and master copies of identifying data are sent back to tablets. Since the tablet contains a copy of the regions identifying data, the recruiter can perform the search locally. In a similar pattern, the regional "host systems" send data to MSIN for statewide consolidation. All records at the MSIN are once again tested for duplicates by comparing names, birthdates, sex and parents parent's names, within or between regions and potential duplicate records are resolved by the region's assigned data steward's using the "Resolve Duplicates" online system. The process is very accurate.

The recruiter submits the COE to the designated State Education Agency (SEA) Reviewer (a regional employee designated by the SEA to perform the quality review activities described here) before it is entered in the COEstar or for online review if it is submitted electronically.

The final quality review of any COE (paper or electronic) is performed by the designated SEA Reviewer.

The designated SEA Reviewer checks for the following:

General review for completeness

Qualifying Move  
Qualifying Work  
Family Information  
School and Health  
Signatures

When the designated SEA Reviewer has completed the examination of the COE, she/he will either:

- Determine that the child is not eligible, mark the COE as NOT ELIGIBLE, notify the recruiter so that the recruiter can notify the family of the decision, file the COE
- Return the COE to the recruiter for clarification or additional information
- Sign the COE and mark the COE as ELIGIBLE, give the COE to the data entry person (paper), or mark as verified (electronic COE)

c. When Were Data Collected: I&R is a year-round activity. Regional offices have been instructed by CDE to submit via COEstar as records are updated or new COEs are created. During peak migration periods, data transfers can occur daily. Generally speaking, the peak periods are late fall/early spring and July/August. Due to the diverse geographic and climatic ranges in a state the size of California, different areas of the state have different peak periods. In Northern California, the peak periods in the northern counties are different from the milder weather in the coastal areas such as Monterey that has year-round agricultural activity. The same is true in Southern California where the milder climates in Los Angeles and Orange Counties offer more year-round work than Riverside or Imperial Counties.

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 child count data was collected

The collection of eligibility data by recruiters, the collection of school enrollment data and the collection of services data are separate processes and happen at different times and sometimes from different places. All additions (new COEs) or updates to student records are saved in COEstar until the data are prepared for transfer to the statewide system by the data entry operator or data steward. The electronic transfer of data to the statewide can be done on a daily basis. This process is ongoing and data is collected all year long as students arrive, are enrolled and are served.

Academic and support service data originates at the school or district. This process is ongoing and data is collected all year long as students arrive, are enrolled and are served. The data is relevant to the child counts in that it indicates that the student is encountered and confirms that they are physically present.

All migrant regions use COEstar to collect the COE information. COEstar configurations vary by region due to size, but each region has one or more "host system" which is the consolidated and centralized database for that region. Most regions have satellite workstations or tablet workstations that collect data and send it to the "host system". MSIN is the consolidated database where COE entry from regions are aggregated into one location for the entire state.

How child counts data are updated

To verify residence in years two and three of eligibility, California requires that regions make contact with all families and youth in their areas at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date) to learn if they family is still in the area, has made another qualifying move, or is in need of program services. The regions must document:

- The nature of the contact; was it by phone or a face-to-face visit
- Verify that the children listed on the COE are still at the residence (have any children moved or become deceased)
- Any children (between the ages of birth up to age 22) have joined the household since the last move
- If a worker has moved to seek or obtain employment, and a child has also moved since the last qualifying arrival date. If it is determined that a new qualifying move has been made, the recruiter must make a personal visit to complete a new COE. Children are not counted unless there is an indication of residency during the reporting period. That means they have to have one or more of the following: qualifying move date, a new residency date, an enrollment date (either residency enrollment for non-attendees or a school enrollment date for attendees) during the period.

How data are organized for the child counts

CDE captures the distinct school and program enrollment periods. For the Regular school year, CDE wants to know the date the student enrolled. This enrollment date can be the beginning of the school term or the date the student enrolled after the start of the term. This is important in identifying students that have had an interruption in their schooling during the regular school year. Students that are present during the entire term are withdrawn on the last day of the term. If a student leaves or quits school before the end of the term, the withdrawal date is the last date of attendance. This information alerts the CDE that there is a potential dropout, a move out of the area or another schooling interruption. New enrollment lines are entered in the student record to clearly identify enrollment during the regular school year as well as enrollments/participation in Summer or Intersession program or service. These data are maintained in the MSIN statewide database.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.



### 1.10.3.3 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.

To avoid reporting duplicate students, the MSIN performs a duplicated student test. The duplicate students test is an automated process that examines names, birth dates, sex and parents names for possible duplicate records between or within regions. The results are compiled into lists that are presented to the regions' data stewards on a management web site for resolution. The data stewards compare the records and make a determination if the students listed are the same or different and mark them appropriately. Once all involved stewards have made a final determination, the records are either kept separately or merged together depending on the outcome of the determination.

The potential duplicates that are presented to the data stewards for resolution are monitored by CDE on the MSIN web site. The CDE consultants can view:

- the current statewide status by region
- The number of unresolved potential duplicates
- The number of pairs resolved today
- Conflicts in duplicate determinations with other regions
- Date last resolved

Children who were between 3 and 21

An automated procedure in the Performance Reporter produces a table that contains a list of all students who might be eligible to be counted or served by the program. One of the conditions that the algorithm looks for is if the child turned 3 years of age during the reporting period or had not turned 22 years of age before the start of the reporting period. Any student record not included in this table cannot be considered for eligibility.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)

To verify residence in years two and three of eligibility, California requires that regions make contact with all families and youth in their areas at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date) to learn if they family is still in the area, has made another qualifying move, or is in need of program services. The regions must document:

- The nature of the contact; was it by phone or a face-to-face visit
- Verify that the children listed on the COE are still at the residence (have any children moved or become deceased)
- Any children (between the ages of birth up to age 22) have joined the household since the last move
- If a worker has moved to seek or obtain employment, and a child has also moved since the last qualifying arrival date.

If it is determined that a new qualifying move has been made, the recruiter must make a personal visit to complete a new COE.

Children are not counted unless there is an indication of residency during the reporting period. That means they have to have one or more of the following: qualifying move date, a new residency date, an enrollment date (either residency enrollment for non-attendees or a school enrollment date for attendees) during the period.

Children who were resident in your state for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)

Some documented encounter event must occur during the reporting year in order for the child to be counted. Those events are a qualifying move, a documented residency move or an enrollment (either non attendee or school enrollment).

Children who in the case of Category 2 - received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term

The Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment and services in a summer or intersession term in order to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. A description indicating the nature of service is also required. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period within the service began.

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

Each student has a unique identification number. That number is used to determine the unique set of students for the state. Due to refinements in EDEN reporting, the calculation of grade has become very complex. Each child's school record history during the year is examined to determine the highest grade attained during the year, during the regular term and the summer term at the state level and at

each LEA the child attended. For Part I reports, each unique child is reported by the maximum grade attained in the state.

---

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.

N/A

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The CA MEP has developed a web based I & R Issues Clarification Center to assure consistency in the interpretation of eligibility guidance and uniform application of eligibility criteria statewide. The purpose of this center is to provide policy and procedure information for I&R topics which are unclear or not specifically addressed in the I&R Manual. Regional staff first address their questions to their I&R Supervisor/Advisory Committee member. Committee members are encouraged to post questions directly into this site. Questioners who prefer anonymity can send questions to CDE by email and their questions appear anonymously. The State I&R Support Team after deliberation and consultation post a discussion and answer to each question. Every effort is made to respond in a timely manner. All Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) members (there are currently over 1,300 active account members representing the 23 Migrant Regional Offices School Districts Migrant Programs and State Staff members) can view all the postings. Once the answer has received final approval by the CDE Migrant Office it is effective immediately. Issues that generate an update to the I&R Manual will be addressed in periodic "Updates to the I&R Manual" posted in the MSIN Intranet Documents section.

The California Department of Education (CDE) has instructed the subgrantees (regions) to perform "Quality Control" checks on all COEs using the quality control checks on all COEs described in the designated SEA Reviewer process described in Section 1.10.3.2. The SEA Reviewer is the first quality control step ensuring the COE from the recruiter is valid and is the final step before approval. This step must be completed before the data is sent to the state level database (MSIN) and used in reporting. In the 2011 California I&R Manual there is a full description of the roles and process. CDE has developed the following quality control documents to guide the regions in establishing effective and efficient procedures and staff training:

- Identification and Recruitment Manual (includes COE Instructions)
- Guidance related to new Regulations Governing Title I, Part C - Migrant Education Program 34 CFR 200

If information of a COE is in question a follow-up visit/interview is conducted. In addition the CDE I&R manual contains a Certificate of Eligibility Monitoring Checklist and instructions on how to use this checklist. CDE consultants are assigned regions/subgrantees to monitor on an ongoing basis. The process includes the I&R component. The state Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM) monitoring tool includes random sampling and review of COEs. The CPM is a comprehensive review process the CDE has implemented in order to determine if the LEAs are meeting the legal requirements. The Migrant Education Program, CPM Instrument, now includes Dimension VIII, Identification, Recruitment, and Quality Control Systems. The process includes the review of I and R documents, interviews with staff and administrators, as well as observation.

Beginning with 2010-11 CPM process, the monitoring instrument includes the Identification, Recruitment and Quality Control Systems requirements under CFR Section 200.89. The reviewers look for evidence that the LEA is meeting these requirements. The process includes the review of I and R documents, interviews with staff and administrators, as well as observation. The evidence has to show that the LEA provides comprehensive training to recruiters; provides supervision, review, and evaluation of individual recruiters; implements a formal process for resolving eligibility questions; that each COE is examined by qualified recruiters; Implements a process to validate the eligibility, including re-interviewing; records actions taken to improve the system-periodic reviews; review process for implementing corrective actions. The reviewer can select as many COE as he/she needs to determine if the requirement is being met. Among other evidence required for review include documents such as: comprehensive training records, records related to the recruiters' supervision and evaluation, COE verification records, annual re-interviews reports, quality control records, and corrective action records. Among the staff interviewed include: administrators, designated SEA reviewers, regional I and R coordinators, recruiters, quality control specialists, and parents. Observation includes: the implementation of the quality control procedures, COE verification process, process to validate eligibility determinations, and the process for implementing corrective actions.

Migrant Education staffs responsible for interviewing migrant families and completing COEs receive ongoing training at the regional level and also statewide training is provided. Statewide training is provided annually at the Migrant Student Identification and Recruitment and Data Training. At the regional level it is common practice for staff to meet once a month for training.

At the collection/electronic-input stage COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Each COE can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes. COEstar presents an electronic facsimile of the actual paper COE developed by California and approved by the OME. COEstar prohibits deleting COEs but if a family is later determined to be ineligible, the COE can be marked as ineligible and will not be considered in CSPR reports. Once a COE is confirmed to be accurate by the assigned reviewer, it is locked to prevent any subsequent changes and only an administrator can unlock the COE.

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.

To comply with federal regulations (citation) and provide follow up to the findings documented in the California Migrant Education Program Prospective Re-Interviews School Year 2008-2009, the California Department of Education (CDE) implemented the following actions beginning May 1, 2010.

1.0 Regions 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9,10,11,12, 13, 16, 18, 19,20,21,22, and 24, conducted regional prospective re-interviews for children with new qualifying enrollments between September 1, 2009, and the date the random samples were drawn. Regions were required to adhere to the following procedures in conducting these re-interviews.

#### Sampling

- A. For regions with child counts of more than 1000, the Region conducted at least 50 valid, randomly selected child eligibility re-interviews.
- B. For regions with child counts of less than 1000, the Region conducted at least 25 valid, randomly selected child eligibility re-interviews.
- C. The CDE drew the child sample for each region.
- D. The sampling design accounted for non-responses to ensure the required sample size of completed re-interviews.

#### Re-interviewer Criteria and Re-interview Process

- A. Re-interviews were conducted by a trained recruiter who has experience in conducting identification and recruitment responsibilities and has received training on conducting prospective re-interviews.
- B. The re-interview was not conducted by the recruiter who completed the initial interview.
- C. Regions utilized CDE adopted instruments for the prospective re-interviews.
- D. The re-interviews were conducted with the parent or guardian whose name and signature appear on the original Certificate of Eligibility (COE) using a face-to-face approach. If a face-to-face interview was deemed impractical, the Region was required to request prior approval from the CDE for an alternative method, with justification.

2.0 Those regions that comprised the highest contributions to the state's discrepancy rate (Regions 1, 4, 6, 14, 17 and 23) in the 2008-09 prospective re-interviews conducted prospective re-interviews for children with new qualifying enrollments between September 1, 2009, and the date the random samples were drawn. Regions were required to adhere to the following procedures in conducting these re-interviews.

#### Sampling

- A. The sample included at least 75 valid, randomly selected children COE's.
- B. The sample was designed to produce a defect rate for the region.
- C. The CDE drew the children sample for each region.
- D. The sampling design accounted for non-responses to ensure the required sample size of completed re-interviews.

#### Re-interviewer Criteria and Re-interview Process

- A. Re-interviews were conducted by independent re-interviewers trained to conduct prospective re-interviews and to understand and apply program eligibility requirements, including requirements related to issues or special circumstances specific to the Region.
- B. Re-interviewers were not CDE or local operating agency (Region or district) employees working to administer or operate the State or local Migrant Education Program (MEP) and were not persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested.
- C. The re-interviews were conducted with the parent or guardian whose name and signature appear on the original Certificate of Eligibility (COE) using a face-to-face approach. If a face-to-face interview was deemed impractical, the Region was required to request prior approval from the CDE for an alternative method, with justification.
- D. Regions utilized CDE adopted instruments for the prospective re-interviews.

3.0 Regions 4, 17, and 23, also conducted 50, additional, valid prospective re-interviews utilizing a stratified random sampling for winter moves. COEs having "winter moves" are COEs in which a family (or youth), who resided in a particular district during the fall of the 2009- 10 school year, returned from travel to Mexico and arrived back in the same district with a QAD between 12/20/09 and 1/20/10. These designated regions were required to adhere to the Re-Interviewer Criteria and Procedures and Reporting Requirements listed under 2.0 and 5.0.

4.0 In conducting an analysis by recruiter on the ineligible COE's identified in the 2008-09 prospective re-interviews, the CDE encountered nine recruiters in Regions 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 21 and 23, that completed 2 or more of the ineligible COEs. In addition to the re-interview requirements identified above, these regions also conducted valid, random prospective re-interviews on 5% of the COEs completed by each of these recruiters between September 1, 2009 and the date the random samples were drawn. These designated regions were required to adhere to the Re-Interviewer Criteria and Procedures and Reporting Requirements identified in 1.0 above.

#### 5.0 Reporting Requirements

- A. A prospective re-interview plan included the following:
  - Re-interview team; identify roles and responsibilities
  - Training to be provided
  - Timeline
  - Appeal process
  - Assurances for documentation and reporting requirements

For the Regional Sample a total of 1246 re-interviews were conducted for 1734 sampled children in 22 California regions, representing a response rate of 72%. Most non-response was due to the fact that families moved and the re-interviewers were unable to locate them. In several regions, very high rates of non-response were found for individuals who self-qualified as the worker (as opposed to qualifying through the work of a parent or guardian. It is therefore likely that the results of the re-interviewing do not fully apply self-qualifying individuals. It appeared upon review of the data that many of these individuals were out-of-school youth who worked in short-term crops or tasks, and who had moved on prior to the re-interview period.

Of the 1246, 113 children were found to have ineligible COE moves and 102 children were found to be ineligible on any identified move. When weighted for sampling and non-response the overall rate of COE move ineligibility was 9.1%, while the overall eligibility rate was 8.1%. Due to the large sample size, the confidence intervals for these rates are small, less than +/-2% each. The confidence intervals for the regions tend to be larger, due to the smaller regional sample sizes and higher error rates in some regions. The primary reasons for ineligibility included the family (33 children) or child (26 children) not making a move within the past three years and the reported qualifying worker not seeking or obtaining qualifying work (28 children). In addition, 14 children were qualified based on moves that, upon re-interview

were determined to be vacation moves.

Another 463 children (approximately 37%) had errors on their COEs that were not serious enough to disqualify them, but which should be corrected and/or prevented in the future. These included misspelled, incomplete or incorrect parent or child names, incorrect cities moved from or to, incorrect birthdates for children, and discrepancies in the crop or task for the qualifying worker.

For the regions required to report on their identified Winter Movers, the cases drawn based on the sampling plan represented a census of winter movers identified by the cutoff date of May 31st. Of these 99 were located and 31 (31%) were found to be ineligible. The primary reason for ineligibility was that the move recorded was a vacation move. In another 22 percent of cases, sampled children had errors (e.g. misspelled names, discrepancies in crop or task) on the COE which did not disqualify them, but should be corrected and/or avoided in the future.

For the regions required to report on recruiters who were selected for targeted re-interviewing based on prior re-interviewing discrepancies, 56 out of 78 sampled re-interviews were conducted, for a response rate of 72%. In all 6 COE's (11%).

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The vendors, WestEd and TROMIK Technology, provide reports to CDE and the Regional offices on an ongoing basis. The reports include student information with respect to eligibility, enrollment and services. WestEd is contracted by CDE to manage and maintain the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN), the statewide migrant student database and student locator. TROMIK Technology's COEstar software is licensed by CDE to collect the eligibility, enrollment and service information at the region and district level.

WestEd provides continuous feedback to the regions and CDE regarding eligibility enrollment, services and mobility throughout the year, via online reports, and the duplicates resolution page.

Together, they provides regional directors current information on their current recruitment efforts. If the child counts in a region(s) is much lower or higher than the year before vendors and CDE consultants work with the regions to insure that the data is correct. Data are checked for completeness throughout the year.

In addition COEstar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data. Since all COEstar data originates with the collection of the COE, COEstar is included in the overall quality control process. Additional data like enrollment and services data is thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

COEstar does not merge data. All data kept by COEstar databases is relational based on internal keys and all information for a child is related. The system does support data synchronization between multiple stand-alone systems using very accurate and proprietary technology developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation. This method relies on record stamping using keys and data signatures to determine how data is exchanged and consolidated. The process is similar to other database synchronization methods but is much more refined and precise.

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.

The CSPR Part I counts are calculated using two different programs and algorithms, independently developed. One resides on MSIN and produces the monthly CSPR counts and the final annual count. The other is a stand-alone program called the Performance Reporter which produces the report to be submitted and all subsequent EDEN files. Upon the cutoff date established by the state, the database is locked and an archive copy is made to be kept for future audit purposes. Both programs are then run against the final data and the results are compared on a student by student basis to confirm the accuracy of the final CSPR counts. Any discrepancies are examined and compared to the business rules. Any discrepancies from the business rules are repaired in the program or programs causing the discrepancy and the results are again compared. For 2010, there were no discrepancies between the two programs.

In years past, some small discrepancies were noted and repaired in accordance with OME rules, regulations or CDE rules. They were the result of highly exceptional and rare data cases which can occur when examining over a million records. The business rules for the CSPR are the CSPR instructions, OME rules and current regulations established by OME

The State Director reviews the CSPR counts monthly and reviews the State Summary file produced by the Performance Reporter showing the state level, region level and LEA level count breakouts. Any concerns are addressed before the final report is submitted. The first State Summary files are available for inspection in August.

In addition to the steps described above, prior to certifying data on the CSPR, the program office must deliver a copy of the supporting data (e.g., Eden data file, etc.) and business rules on a CD or DVD to the department's CSPR Coordinator.

#### Criteria for Supporting Documentation

- Should support numerical data (not narrative) responses to the CSPR.
- Should provide sufficient detail to reproduce the CSPR data entries if needed in any future audits or evaluations.
- Should be in a format that an auditor can read and understand (e.g., Excel or MS-Word). If the nature of the data requires providing it in another format (e.g., SAS) the office should contact the CSPR Coordinator and provide an explanation of how the auditor can view the supporting documentation.
- The data must be of sufficient detail to allow an auditor to see underlying detail that supports totals. For example, if the CSPR data is a count of districts with a specific status, the supporting document should list the data at the district level. If the CSPR is a count of schools with a status, the supporting document should list the data for each school. The document should also reflect the sum of the detail.

Each supporting document on the CD should be named to reflect the corresponding CSPR section number (e.g., CSPR 1.6.1).

- The CD and CD case must have a label that clearly reflects the following:
  - o The year and part(s) of the CSPR.
  - o For each section of the CSPR, the full name and phone number of the person that is responsible for answering any questions related to the supporting documentation.

Totals in supporting documentation must match, exactly, the totals reported in the CSPR.

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 CDE will implement the following corrective actions in order to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations as a result of the prospective re-interview results.

- 1) All students that were found to be not eligible as a result of the re-interviews were deleted prior to submitting the child counts.
- 2) The CDE will host the 5th Annual State I&R Forum on February 8-9, 2011, participants will receive the 2011 Revised I&R Manual that includes the new Non Regulatory Guidance. Participants will include, directors, recruiters, program coordinators and data specialists.
- 3) A special Support Session for Regions of Interest will be required for the eleven region who were the highest contributors to the state's 2010-2011 defect rate
- 4) The CDE will convene a special One Day SEA Reviewers Institute on February 10, 2010 with mandatory attendance for all regional designated SEA Reviewers. Participants will receive training on their role and responsibilities in certification of the eligibility of migratory children and accuracy of information on the COE.
- 4) The CDE will host its third state I&R Advisory Committee Meeting on March 30, 2011. Training and discussion on areas that contributed to the state error rate, such as winter moves, child did not move, family did not move, did not seek or obtain qualifying work.

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.

CDE MEP is implementing an ongoing independent audit and re-interview process to monitor and maintain data quality and ensure eligibility determinations are appropriate so that counts are accurate.  
The state administrator has already submitted a corrective action plan, Action Plan for 2009-2010 Regional Deficiency/Error Rates from Re-Interview Reports, and a summary of a proposed process for Regional quality improvements.