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

FLORIDA

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:

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2009-10 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
X   Part I, 2009-10   Part II, 2009-10

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

Address:
325 W Gaines St, Suite 644
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Sara Dixon

Telephone: (850) 245-9753

Fax: (850) 245-5036

e-mail: Sara.Dixon@fldoe.org

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Eric J. Smith

Monday, March 14, 2011, 12:25:09 PM

Signature   Date

Verification spreadsheet sent via email to Kenneth Taylor.

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.

Florida's State Board of Education (SBE) approved the adoption of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics in July, 2010. Full implementation of these Common Core standards will be completed during the 2013-2014 school year.

Florida also completed a revision to its Fine Arts (Dance, Music, Theater, and Visual Art) and World Languages content standards which are scheduled to be presented to the SBE for adoption on December 17, 2010.

Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards for Health, Physical Education, and Social Studies were also revised and adopted by the SBE in December, 2008.

In September, 2009, the State Board of Education approved a new rule requiring a periodic review of content standards for potential revision within a maximum period of 12 years.

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.

Florida has developed plans for the transition to new reading and mathematics assessments aligned to its revised Sunshine State Standards. Items used to construct the new assessments were field-tested in the spring of 2010. The baseline administration will occur in the spring of 2011, and the new academic achievement standards will be established in the fall of 2011.

No revisions or changes to the Florida Alternate Assessment or the alternate achievement standards are currently planned.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

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

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	30.0
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	70.0
Comments:	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
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	No
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	No
Other	Yes
Comments:,	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	1,606,974		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,757		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	41,245		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	367,119		>97
Hispanic	424,165		>97
White, non-Hispanic	714,870		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	230,905	223,372	96.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	104,324		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	908,318		>97
Migratory students	9,351		>97
Male	824,525		>97
Female	782,449		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	55,651	28.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	123,794	63.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,619	8.5
Total	196,064	
Comments: These data are accurate. 9th grade CWD students who are assessed and reported in N81, N75, and N78 are excluded in N093 since we report only grade 10 in N093 per EDFacts/DANS reporting requirements. Below are the totals from N081 (and N75 and N78), N093 and their differences: MATH - N81/N75 WDIS total is 223372; N93 WDIS total is 196064. The difference is 27308 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81/N75 not in N93). RLA - N81/N78 WDIS total is 224031; N93 WDIS total is 196603. The difference is 27428 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81/N78 not in N93).		

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	1,608,456		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,758		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	41,264		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	367,683		>97
Hispanic	424,621		>97
White, non-Hispanic	715,269		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	231,104	224,031	96.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	104,461		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	909,248		>97
Migratory students	9,359		>97
Male	825,505		>97
Female	782,951		>97
Comments:			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	54,741	27.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	125,212	63.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,650	8.5
Total	196,603	
Comments: These data are accurate. 9th grade CWD students who are assessed and reported in N81, N75, and N78 are excluded in N093 since we report only grade 10 in N093 per EDFacts/DANS reporting requirements. Below are the totals from N081 (and N75 and N78), N093 and their differences: MATH - N81/N75 WDIS total is 223372; N93 WDIS total is 196064. The difference is 27308 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81/N75 not in N93). RLA - N81/N78 WDIS total is 224031; N93 WDIS total is 196603. The difference is 27428 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81/N78 not in N93).		

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	585,964	565,844	96.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,005	1,928	96.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,104		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	133,508	127,059	95.2
Hispanic	152,335		>97
White, non-Hispanic	265,275	256,980	96.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	81,181	76,004	93.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	37,287	35,788	96.0
Economically disadvantaged students	314,517	302,503	96.2
Migratory students	3,178		>97
Male	298,030	286,458	96.1
Female	287,934	279,386	97.0
Comments: For the CWD sub-category, there were 406 students who participated but the score was invalid (and thus not reported in N081 as a participant). This makes the actual number who participated 76816 which makes the percent 94.6 - still less than 95%.			

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 <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do <u>not</u> include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	22,258	29.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	46,980	61.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,766	8.9
Total	76,004	
Comments: These data are accurate.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	207,005	161,577	78.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	781	606	77.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,340	4,830	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	48,834	31,376	64.3
Hispanic	57,063	43,359	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	86,854	74,891	86.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	32,148	18,581	57.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,642	12,485	57.7
Economically disadvantaged students	129,165	91,880	71.1
Migratory students	1,475	1,020	69.2
Male	106,771	83,634	78.3
Female	100,234	77,943	77.8
Comments: This data is accurate.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	206,902	149,464	72.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	780	546	70.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,334	4,535	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	48,821	27,824	57.0
Hispanic	56,996	38,598	67.7
White, non-Hispanic	86,835	71,673	82.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	32,148	14,867	46.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,542	9,416	43.7
Economically disadvantaged students	129,071	82,394	63.8
Migratory students	1,472	786	53.4
Male	106,704	72,648	68.1
Female	100,198	76,816	76.7
Comments: This data is accurate.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198,652	147,549	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	737	553	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,184	4,604	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	45,154	26,619	59.0
Hispanic	53,974	38,474	71.3
White, non-Hispanic	86,164	71,569	83.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	30,658	15,734	51.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,297	8,704	50.3
Economically disadvantaged students	120,204	79,544	66.2
Migratory students	1,223	744	60.8
Male	101,329	76,021	75.0
Female	97,323	71,528	73.5
Comments: This data is accurate.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198,647	142,479	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	738	527	71.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,174	4,387	84.8
Black, non-Hispanic	45,151	25,120	55.6
Hispanic	53,944	37,167	68.9
White, non-Hispanic	86,205	69,618	80.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	30,704	13,686	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,214	7,517	43.7
Economically disadvantaged students	120,175	75,711	63.0
Migratory students	1,222	656	53.7
Male	101,350	70,353	69.4
Female	97,297	72,126	74.1
Comments: This data is accurate.			

OMB NO. 1880-0541   Page 17

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 (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198,038	124,994	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	677	438	64.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,977	4,132	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	44,411	19,284	43.4
Hispanic	53,590	32,228	60.1
White, non-Hispanic	87,182	64,198	73.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	30,069	11,587	38.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,317	4,372	32.8
Economically disadvantaged students	117,883	62,147	52.7
Migratory students	1,200	569	47.4
Male	101,525	65,464	64.5
Female	96,513	59,530	61.7
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	197,930	137,532	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	677	484	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,963	4,137	83.4
Black, non-Hispanic	44,387	23,558	53.1
Hispanic	53,536	35,276	65.9
White, non-Hispanic	87,171	68,731	78.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	30,061	12,544	41.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,227	4,627	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	117,796	70,636	60.0
Migratory students	1,200	568	47.3
Male	101,449	66,217	65.3
Female	96,481	71,315	73.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	197,189	97,356	49.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	674	332	49.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,965	3,308	66.6
Black, non-Hispanic	44,245	12,340	27.9
Hispanic	53,437	22,649	42.4
White, non-Hispanic	86,709	54,938	63.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	29,740	8,888	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,840	3,031	19.1
Economically disadvantaged students	117,333	43,271	36.9
Migratory students	1,195	278	23.3
Male	101,039	51,933	51.4
Female	96,150	45,423	47.2
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	195,887	112,575	57.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	728	458	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,980	3,966	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	44,186	17,107	38.7
Hispanic	52,277	27,856	53.3
White, non-Hispanic	86,652	58,969	68.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27,742	7,907	28.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,354	2,148	20.7
Economically disadvantaged students	114,914	52,849	46.0
Migratory students	1,130	456	40.4
Male	100,903	57,670	57.2
Female	94,984	54,905	57.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	195,908	130,939	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	729	515	70.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,973	4,067	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	44,224	21,486	48.6
Hispanic	52,246	32,536	62.3
White, non-Hispanic	86,673	67,276	77.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27,765	10,212	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,308	2,338	22.7
Economically disadvantaged students	114,920	64,666	56.3
Migratory students	1,129	484	42.9
Male	100,928	64,731	64.1
Female	94,980	66,208	69.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198,904	122,573	61.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	740	474	64.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,247	4,339	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	45,243	19,313	42.7
Hispanic	52,650	30,963	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	88,553	63,260	71.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27,551	8,645	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,226	2,860	28.0
Economically disadvantaged students	113,469	57,461	50.6
Migratory students	1,202	568	47.3
Male	102,281	61,560	60.2
Female	96,623	61,013	63.1
Comments: The data is accurate.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198,962	135,752	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	739	517	70.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,239	4,226	80.7
Black, non-Hispanic	45,260	23,106	51.1
Hispanic	52,660	33,570	63.7
White, non-Hispanic	88,582	69,529	78.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27,609	10,914	39.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,166	2,501	24.6
Economically disadvantaged students	113,505	65,870	58.0
Migratory students	1,202	534	44.4
Male	102,300	67,728	66.2
Female	96,662	68,024	70.4
Comments: The data is accurate.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	195,233	132,772	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	672	456	67.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,944	4,326	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	43,869	20,957	47.8
Hispanic	51,216	33,122	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	88,576	69,603	78.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27,068	10,168	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,668	2,957	30.6
Economically disadvantaged students	107,417	61,713	57.5
Migratory students	1,076	556	51.7
Male	99,437	67,908	68.3
Female	95,796	64,864	67.7
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	195,343	108,652	55.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	674	398	59.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,943	3,618	73.2
Black, non-Hispanic	43,915	16,625	37.9
Hispanic	51,214	26,207	51.2
White, non-Hispanic	88,639	58,138	65.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27,158	7,448	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,621	1,141	11.9
Economically disadvantaged students	107,475	47,130	43.9
Migratory students	1,069	331	31.0
Male	99,547	52,356	52.6
Female	95,796	56,296	58.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	194,097	84,275	43.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	669	301	45.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,938	3,159	64.0
Black, non-Hispanic	43,508	9,734	22.4
Hispanic	50,975	18,123	35.6
White, non-Hispanic	88,085	50,032	56.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	26,615	5,828	21.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,608	861	8.1
Economically disadvantaged students	106,597	32,142	30.2
Migratory students	1,068	217	20.3
Male	98,734	46,681	47.3
Female	95,363	37,594	39.4
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	386,322	267,423	69.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,320	935	70.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,206	8,740	85.6
Black, non-Hispanic	86,912	42,512	48.9
Hispanic	97,037	63,796	65.7
White, non-Hispanic	180,152	143,602	79.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	48,136	17,632	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,583	6,150	31.4
Economically disadvantaged students	187,586	109,752	58.5
Migratory students	1,872	932	49.8
Male	196,365	137,088	69.8
Female	189,957	130,335	68.6
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	388,539	171,277	44.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,323	575	43.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,217	6,119	59.9
Black, non-Hispanic	87,698	19,808	22.6
Hispanic	97,649	37,569	38.5
White, non-Hispanic	180,884	101,903	56.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	48,586	10,379	21.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,644	1,414	7.2
Economically disadvantaged students	188,973	58,615	31.0
Migratory students	1,886	355	18.8
Male	197,769	83,731	42.3
Female	190,770	87,546	45.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	174,558		
American Indian or Alaska Native	585		
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,911		
Black, non-Hispanic	39,306		
Hispanic	43,445		
White, non-Hispanic	82,186		
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	19,649		
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,340		
Economically disadvantaged students	78,573		
Migratory students	826		
Male	86,685		
Female	87,873		
Comments: The data is accurate.			

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	3,423	471	13.8
Districts	73		
Comments: This data has been verified and is accurate. Added during 2009-2010 CSPR Part I Data Verification: Blank fields above = 0			

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 <u>not</u> include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	1,755	147	8.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,717	142	8.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	38	5	13.2
Comments: The data in this section are populated by the data reported in EDFacts file N103 AYP Status and N129 CCD Schools. The reporting period for N103 is the testing window, which in Florida is the spring semester. The reporting period for N129 is Oct 1 of the current year. Due to these timing differences, we have 5 SW schools in N129 that do not have an AYP status in N103.			
In addition, based on guidance from Partner Support, Florida reported schools with too few students to calculate AYP as AYP Status = NOT REQUIRED. There were 42 such schools: 2 TAS and 40 SWP schools.			
As a result the count of Title I schools shown in row 1, column 1 in Section 1.4.2 shows 47 less Title I schools than there actually are in Florida.			
The total number of 09-10 Title I schools in Florida is 1,802: 1762 SWP and 40 TAS.			

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
72		
Comments: # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10 = Zero. Added during 2009-2010 CSPR Part I Data Verification: Blank fields above = 0		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: Through the Differentiated Accountability plan and subsequent wavier awarded to the Florida Department of Education (amendment approved April 8, 2010), Florida is incorporating nearly all the options available to schools under corrective action or restructuring.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Through the Differentiated Accountability plan and subsequent wavier awarded to the Florida Department of Education (amendment approved April 8, 2010), Florida is incorporating nearly all the options available to schools under corrective action or restructuring.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State'ts Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Department provided direct technical assistance through the Differentiated Accountability office and Regional teams to ensure a statewide system of support. While direct support was provided to individual low-performing schools in the state, the regional support teams also partnered with LEA's to build local capacity allowing districts to develop the skills and processes needed to conduct their own site visits and follow-up reviews. This capacity building provided LEAs with the tools necessary to further support all schools and ensure a continuum of growth.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	22	3
Comments: Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete on 09-30-10.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	09/30/10

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

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

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

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

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

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the **mathematics** assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	328,443	1,180,965
Total number of students who were proficient or above in **mathematics** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	190,791	781,705
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in **mathematics** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	58.1	66.2
Total number of students who completed the **reading/language arts** assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	328,570	1,182,837
Total number of students who were proficient or above in **reading/language arts** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	180,564	720,679
Percentage of students who were proficient in **reading/language arts** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	55.0	60.9
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **made adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10	40
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2009-10	9

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10	870
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in *"Column 1 Response Options Box"* below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	**Description of "Other Strategies"** This response is limited to 500 characters.	**Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status**	**Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)** (See response options in *"Column 6 Response Options Box"* below)	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"** This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		422	3	419	A	
3		3	0	3	A	
6 = Combo 1	Combo = 1 + 2	2	0	2	A	
7 = Combo 2	Combo = 1 + 3	453	6	447	A	
8 = Combo 3	Combo = 1 + 2 + 3	24	0	24	A	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) identifies effective strategies to improve student achievement in the Request for Application (RFA) for 1003 funds. The RFA is disseminated to all eligible local educational agencies (LEA) through FDOE's paperless communication system, is uploaded to FDOE's website, and is directly emailed to federal program coordinators of LEAs.

FDOE's Statewide System of Support has placed curriculum experts and Regional Executive Directors in regions across the state to provide technical assistance and support to LEAs and schools in identifying and implementing effective strategies to improve student achievement.

A conference call was held to provide further technical assistance to federal program coordinators in completing the requirements of the RFA and to ensure effective strategies were utilized for the program year.

The results of the previous year's Consolidated State Performance Report are available on FDOE's website.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

Comments:

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Florida did not expend any 1003g funds and did not have any 1003g schools in 09-10.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state determined that the most appropriate action was to reduce administrative funds and implemented this action by placing a cap on the amount of indirect costs charged to the Title I, Part A project. These funds were then used to support the schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, and restructuring that contributed to the LEA being identified as an LEA in corrective action.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

   For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	602,443
Applied to transfer	28,693
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	17,469
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 10,037,567

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	0

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	667,977
Applied for supplemental educational services	105,955
Received supplemental educational services	72,837
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 89,827,106
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	2,233,422	2,125,369	95.2	108,053	4.8
All elementary classes	1,297,190	1,258,774	97.0	38,416	3.0
All secondary classes	936,232	866,595	92.6	69,637	7.4

The reason there was basically a doubling of classes in core academic subjects is because Florida has been approved to gradually phase in reporting these data for the entire school year. That is, prior to the 0910 Florida only reported these data from the fall semester; in 0910 Florida reported these data from both fall and spring semesters. Starting in 1011 Florida will report these data for the entire school year, i.e., fall, spring, summer.

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.

Florida uses a departmentalized approach.

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	29.1
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	11.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	48.8
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category listed as "other" may be a course taught by, but not limited to, interim substitutes, long term substitutes, teachers needing to complete Reading Endorsements, Exceptional Student Education, and Social Studies course work.

	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)	41.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	15.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	43.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category listed as "other" may be a course taught by, but not limited to, interim substitutes, long term substitutes, teachers needing to complete Reading Endorsements, Exceptional Student Education, and Social Studies course work.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	319,653	309,394	96.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	298,965	289,051	96.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	70,531	61,991	87.9
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	306,575	288,918	94.2

1.5.4 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	81.1	39.4
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who are eligible for Free or Reduced Priced Lunch in a school	
Secondary schools	69.3	31.5
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who are eligible for Free or Reduced Priced Lunch in a school	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

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

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because Florida's labels are different for these data, it is unclear how we should answer this question. These are the Instructional Models used in Florida to provide ELLs comprehensive instruction:

Sheltered - English

Sheltered - Core/Basic Subject Areas

Mainstream/Inclusion - English

Mainstream/Inclusion - Core/Basic Subject Areas

Maintenance and/or Developmental Bilingual Education

Dual Language (Two-way Developmental Bilingual Education)

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined 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	260,202
Comments:	

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

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

	#
	LEP
students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	247,015
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	186,861
Haitian; Haitian Creole	30,166
Portuguese	2,913
Vietnamese	2,903
French	2,248

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	202,386
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	22,539
Total	224,925
Comments: The data in this section (1.6.3.1.1) are populated by the data reported in EDFacts file N137, LEP English Language Test. The reporting period for N137 is the testing window, which in Florida is the spring semester. The data in section 1.6.2.1 are populated by data reported in EDFacts file N141, LEP Enrolled. The reporting period for N141 is the entire school year. It is for this reason that the data in 1.6.3.1.1 and the data in 1.6.2.1 differ. The data reported in 1.6.2.1 and 1.6.3.1.1 are correct per the guidance in EDFacts. There are three reasons why a student would be reported as 'NOT TESTED'. First, in order to be considered TESTED they must take all three parts of the test. If they miss one part then they are considered NOT TESTED. Second, we match to survey 3 which is in February. The test is given later in the year which gives more time for students to change schools. Last, there are always some students that just don't get tested.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	32,960
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP	16.3
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	201,932
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	22,419
Total	224,351
Comments: The data in this section (1.6.3.2.1) are populated by the data reported in EDFacts file N138, T3 LEP ELP Test. The reporting period for N138 is the testing window, which in Florida is the spring semester. The data in section 1.6.2.2 are populated by data reported in EDFacts file N116, T3 LEP Students Served. The reporting period for N116 is the entire school year. It is for this reason that the data in 1.6.3.2.1 and the data in 1.6.2.2 differ. The data reported in 1.6.2.2 and 1.6.3.2.1 are correct per the guidance in EDFacts. There are three reasons why a student would be reported as 'NOT TESTED'. First in order to be considered TESTED they must take all three parts of the test. If they miss one part then they are considered NOT TESTED. Second, we match to survey 3 which is in February. The test is given later in the year which gives more time for students to change schools. Last, there are always some students that just don't get tested.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	

	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	51,462

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	46,110	30.6		
Attained proficiency	32,892	16.3		
Comments: Florida does not have a single state target for AMAO1 (progress). Instead Florida has different targets for AMAO1 (progress) on three separate assessments: Listening/Speaking (70%), Writing (54%) and Reading (56%). Students in Florida exceeded the target in each assessment. The number and (and percent) of students who met the target in Listening/Speaking is 92,517 (74%); 81,645 (65%) in Writing; and 83,562 (67%) in Reading. Florida does not have a single state target for AMAO2 (proficiency attainment). Instead Florida has different targets for different grade clusters: K-2 (15%), 3-5 (16%), 6-8 (13%) and 9-12 (12%). Students in Florida exceeded the target in each grade cluster. The number and percent of students who met the target in K-2 is 20,501 (20%); grade cluster 3-5 is 12,372 (21%); grade cluster 6-8 is 6,329 (19%); grade cluster 9-12 is 5,244 (15%). The student counts for the Progress and Attainment targets (cited above in this comment) are duplicated for each assessment. That is, a student would be counted on each assessment that he or she made progress or attained proficiency. But the counts of students who made progress or attained proficiency overall show in the Results column in 1.6.3.2.2 is a count of students who made progress or attained proficiency in all three assessments.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No Response
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No Response
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No Response
Comments: Florida does not assess in Native Languages.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Comments: Florida does not assess in Native Languages.

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: Florida does not assess in Native Languages.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
45,010	8,560	53,570
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
53,831	36,637	68.1	17,194
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
53,886	34,532	64.1	19,354
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,891	3,564	32.7	7,327
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	47
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	36
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	29
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	1
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	8
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	41
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	41
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	41

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: Florida does not have any consortia members. As a result of the verification process, this answer has been verified.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No

Comments: As reported in 1.6.4.1, none of the districts in Florida made all three AMAOs. As a result, Florida did not meet all three AMAOs.

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	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	

Comments:

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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
81,995	8,868	3

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	44,374
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	0

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.

Florida's Consent Decree requires ESOL content area teachers to be ESOL endorsed or certified. To utilize Title III funds for certified/licensed teachers would be considered as supplanting instead of supplementing. Therefore, there are no data to collect.

* 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	42	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	36	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	36	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	35	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	30	
Other (Explain in comment box)	33	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	44	16,042
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	13	330
PD provided to principals	30	270
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	21	47
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	33	991
PD provided to community based organization personnel	3	5
Total	45	17,685

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other = a survey course for content area teachers teaching English Language Learners.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 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.

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/09	07/01/09	50
Comments: Florida received the Title III federal allocation 07/01/09. Prior to receiving the funds, LEAs began the process of submitting preliminary grant requests and working with Florida DOE staff from 05/09 until 07/09, in order to expedite the grant writing process. By August/09, 20 LEAs had received their allocations (30 days); 17 LEAs received allocations within 60 days; and 12 of the remaining LEAs received funds after 60 days.		

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.

Florida met the distribution of funds to Subgrantees on time.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	

Comments: Florida has no persistently dangerous schools.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	63.3
Hispanic	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	83.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	47.2
Limited English proficient	56.8
Economically disadvantaged	65.1
Migratory students	59.9
Male	72.3
Female	80.0
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Florida does not report transitional graduation rate data but rather a four-year adjust cohort graduation rate.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	>3
American Indian or Alaska Native	>3
Asian or Pacific Islander	>3
Black, non-Hispanic	4.3
Hispanic	3.0
White, non-Hispanic	>3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5.6
Limited English proficient	4.0
Economically disadvantaged	3.0
Migratory students	3.1
Male	3.0
Female	>3
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	7	7
LEAs with subgrants	65	65
Total	72	72
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	1,178
K	32	5,297
1	32	4,794
2	29	4,555
3	22	4,695
4	30	3,943
5	21	3,788
6	13	3,434
7	17	3,453
8	14	3,161
9	18	3,205
10	21	2,461
11	20	2,241
12	13	2,206
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total	284	48,411
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	25	8,188
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	245	36,122
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<10	1,101
Hotels/Motels	N<10	3,000
Total	284	48,411
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	5,297
1	4,794
2	4,555
3	4,695
4	3,943
5	3,788
6	3,434
7	3,453
8	3,161
9	3,205
10	2,461
11	2,241
12	2,206
Ungraded	N<10
Total	47,233
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	6,196
Migratory children/youth	922
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,506
Limited English proficient students	7,215
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	51
Expedited evaluations	25
Staff professional development and awareness	58
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	49
Transportation	42
Early childhood programs	27
Assistance with participation in school programs	47
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	42
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	42
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	53
Coordination between schools and agencies	51
Counseling	33
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	32
Clothing to meet a school requirement	46
School supplies	55
Referral to other programs and services	53
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	40
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	12
School Selection	8
Transportation	17
School records	11
Immunizations	14
Other medical records	11
Other Barriers – in comment box below	20

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	3,341	1,952
4	2,730	1,503
5	2,701	1,418
6	2,414	1,186
7	2,349	1,196
8	2,087	775
High School	3,255	771
Comments:		

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	3,350	2,098
4	2,734	1,542
5	2,701	1,161
6	2,403	872
7	2,353	971
8	2,082	996
High School	3,220	1,492
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4,457
K	1,936
1	1,823
2	1,705
3	1,666
4	1,369
5	1,315
6	1,250
7	1,333
8	1,203
9	1,288
10	1,003
11	958
12	741
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	6,782
Total	28,829
Comments:	

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.

Since there is only a 6.31% decrease on Category 1 from 2008-09 to 2009-10, an explanation is not required.

However, it should be noted that the number of pre-school and OSY migrant students in the state increased because of, among other things, the SEA's participation in the OME-funded OSY consortium and heightened awareness towards recruiting these populations.

In addition, there were two events that affected Florida's migrant families and students. In January-February, 2010, Florida experienced a severe freeze throughout the state. Many harvests and crops were influenced, affecting workers, farmers and agriculture in 2010. The second event was the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Migrant fishermen and their families were adversely affected by the spill, which limited their ability to obtain work.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the underlined unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were underlined served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the underlined 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 underlined not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	715
K	361
1	401
2	351
3	306
4	203
5	198
6	180
7	149
8	154
9	182
10	143
11	164
12	11
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	467
Total	3,985
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although there was an increase in the number of districts that received funds for migrant summer programs, the total and individual amount allocated for such programming was less than the year before. There were less migrant funded opportunities for children. This was caused by a reduction in funding available for summer programs, since more funds were used for regular school year efforts.

In addition, there were less summer programs offered for children in general in the state last year. Districts indicated that, due to the slow economy affecting the state, many had opted to offer a reduced number of sessions and during a limited time frame. Other districts offered summer classes only to a specific number of students (example, only to third grade or fifth grade students), based on their achievement scores. District's priorities for serving children in the summer were different, limiting the opportunities available for children. Many districts offered shorted summer sessions, at times that affected families' access and availability, thus limiting their children's participation.

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.

All local student data is transmitted to the state via an automated Management Information System (MIS) - the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System. The data are collected by the school districts through their local systems, and submitted to the state at pre-set times throughout the year, with a nine-month window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. The districts use this same system to transmit the data that are used to calculate the migrant count. This year's count was obtained using the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System using data submitted by the districts in August, 2010 via Survey 5, with updates and corrections up to October 1, 2010. Survey 5 differs from all other surveys in that it is a cumulative count of all students served in all programs during the preceding school year, and therefore captures all migrant students.

Last year's child counts were generated using the same system. In 2002, a data element was added to the Florida Student Information Data Base system the Migrant Status Term, Student Demographic Reporting Format. This data element uses a coding system to indicate whether the migrant child was served in the regular term, summer term, or both.

In Migrant Status Term, a separate code (Code X) is used to identify students who qualified as migrants, but received no services (neither academic nor support services; in the regular or summer term). In 2006, the coding used to indicate that the migrant child was served in the regular term (3) was revised to reflect that the migrant child was enrolled/served--with services provided during the regular school day--(D) or that the migrant child was enrolled/served --with some or all services provided during extended day/week--(E). Extensive technical assistance was provided to school districts to ensure the accuracy of this coding system, including regional workshops and presentations at Florida's annual Information Database Workshop held in June each year and at the technical assistance meeting/workshop usually held in the fall of each year.

ADDED DURING THE 09-10 CSPR PART I DATA VERIFICATION:

10.3.1 Please provide the "preset times" that data are submitted to the state throughout the year, with a nine-month window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. How does this differ from Survey 5?

RESPONSE - For 2009-2010 Survey 5, the due date was August 6, 2010 with a state processing window of August 2 - September 3, 2010. State Processing is the "clean up" window where districts can upload/delete/edit their data every day. After then end of state processing, the state processes records every weekend. Districts have until February 28, 2011 to change their data, however we finalize counts much sooner to be able to meet CSPR and EDEN timelines. Also, the 9 month window has been changed to a 5 to 6 month window for all surveys.

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.

District Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff (recruiters/advocates/liaisons) identify eligible migrant children through face-to-face interviews and document their eligibility using a state approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. This form captures all the necessary data for identification and reporting: student name, parent names, Qualifying Arrival Date, TO/FROM city and state, date of birth, gender, race/ethnicity, country of birth, current school enrollment, etc.

Florida's guidelines require district MEPs to generate a new COE each time a migrant child makes a new qualifying move. In addition, district MEP staff is required to annually contact the child or the child's parent/guardian in order to update the child's COE. Documentation of this process is maintained at the district-level. District MEP staff is trained to verify the information on the COE, and enter it into the local Management Information Services (MIS) data bases. Districts transmit the student-level data from their local systems to Florida's Automated Student Data Base System in Survey 5. A complete description of the system used, along with a complete layout of the data elements, may be found at: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/student_0910.asp

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) staff conducts annual on-site reviews that include re-interviewing selected families to ensure that the information on the COEs is accurate and that the children on the COE are eligible to receive Migrant Education Program services.

ADDED DURING THE 09-10 CSPR PART I DATA VERIFICATION:

10.3.2 Why are children who are eligible NOT included in the count who graduate during the child count year? "State Student Data Base reporting procedures require that any migrant child, who had graduated at the end of the regular school year, would not have a record in the student data base."And "FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "continuation of services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations. To which category of the child count does this refer? Is the State saying that they remove children from the child count in their final year of eligibility, if eligibility ends during the first semester? Please Clarify.

RESPONSE -

Eligible children are reported and filtered based on their Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and Date of Birth (DOB). For 2010, we used a QAD range of QAD > 08/31/06 through < or = 08/31/10 and DOB range of DOB = 09/02/87 through 08/31/07 inclusive. Migrant Eligible students were students with codes of D or E or S or B or X while Migrant Served students had codes of D or E or S or B from the Migrant Status Term Data Element. Data elements used to report these fields can be found on DOE's Student Database Manuals linked here - Migrant Status Term (http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0910/st201_1.pdf), Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) for Migrant Program Eligibility (http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0910/st226_1.pdf) Birth Date (http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0910/st14_1.pdf). To determine 09-10 Continuation of Services counts, we used Codes B or C only from the Migrant Continuation of Services (COS) data element (http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1011/st197_29.pdf), used Term (http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1011/st270_1.pdf) to determine if the student was served by COS in the regular or summer, the same DOB range as all other migrant specs, Date of Birth = 09/02/87 through 08/31/07 inclusive and Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) for Migrant Program Eligibility. We delete students with QAD = 00/00/0000 and EXTENDED QAD to include an additional year; (QAD > 08/31/2005 and < 09/01/2010) to specifically capture students that were receiving Continuation of Services.

QUESTION - "How do you ensure that children who received Continuation of Services, but who were not eligible for the count during the full period of the count, are excluded from the child count?"

RESPONSE - The QAD range is extended an additional year to capture Continuation of Services (COS) students. Even though some of the QADs overlap for a few years when compared to the Child Count Specs, COS students reported on the Continuation of Services data element using Codes B or C are not reported on the Child count.
- CODE A = A child who ceases to be classified as migrant during a school term but who is still eligible for services until the end of the term. (This represents a partial year of services after the child's migrant eligibility has expired.)
- CODE B = A child who ceases to be classified as a migrant but who continues to receive services for one additional school year because comparable services are not available through other programs. (This represents an additional school year of services after the child's migrant eligibility has expired.)
- CODE C = A secondary school student who ceases to be classified as migrant but who is served through credit accrual programs until graduation.

The data element for COS can be found here -

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data from the COEs are entered locally, either at the school or the district level, aggregated for the whole district and transmitted electronically during the required survey periods through Florida's Automated Student Information Data Base System. The Student Demographic Format collects student-level data on all students in Florida, including but not limited to Date of Birth, Qualifying Arrival Date, Country of Birth, and other information about services provided to qualified students. To obtain a student count, the database is queried for all students meeting the criteria for current migrant status in regular and summer categories.

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.

Same process was used to collect and maintain the state's Category 2 count.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The database was queried for all children between the ages of 3 and 22 (Date of Birth range of 9/2/87 through 8/31/07, inclusive, which captures those who were 2 and turned 3 and those who were 21 and turned 22), whose Qualifying Arrival Date is greater than 8/31/06, with a valid Migrant Status Term Code, and an appropriate service for Summer Session. This process is applied to all migrant child cases that are identified as migrant in the state student database and then the cases are sorted by Category I or II using the Migrant Status Term data element. Edit checks for Category I and Category II are performed on the data file generated by this query to delete children who may be included in error. The student counts are then shared with district MEP and Management Information Services (MIS) Departments to verify their data. Districts are provided a reasonable time to make corrections as needed before the revised data is extracted once more. With regard to verifying that those children whose 3rd birthday occurs during the eligibility period are still resident in the State before including them in the child count; on-site monitoring (conducted by State MEP staff) of basic district level quality control procedures being implemented document a standard practice among district MEPs. It is a standard procedure that children who will turn 3 during the eligibility period are flagged by the data clerk (whose responsibility it is to input student data into district data base) at the beginning of each school year or at the time of interview or re-interview of a family. Before data is submitted for the reporting period (Survey 5), data clerks confer with recruiters to ensure that these children/families are still in the district.

The query used finds all migrant children identified within the eligibility reporting period. Since Survey 5 data are cumulative for the entire school year, all those children meeting the eligibility requirements are captured, regardless of their length of stay. Recruiters are in constant contact with their families so that when a child turns three during the reporting period, district MEP staff will then identify that child as migrant on the student data base. The data element Migrant Status Term identifies which term(s) a migratory child was served and/or identified. Further, migratory children selected for inclusion in the count from the State Student Data Base had to have had a Qualifying Arrival Date greater than 8/31/06. State Student Data Base reporting procedures require that any migrant child, who had graduated at the end of the regular school year, would not have a record in the student data base. FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "continuation of services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations.

In addition to the Migrant Status Term data element contained in the Student Demographic Format, data elements in the Federal/State Compensatory Evaluation Format, also transmitted in Survey 5, provide information regarding summer services to migrant students. The summer school code (Category II) cannot be entered on a student without a link to a code for summer services. Each year, a comprehensive presentation is made at the State Data Base Workshop. This presentation targets migrant staff, data clerks, and MIS staff and covers all reporting requirements for migrant students and migrant program data. When the specific Migrant Status Term data element was created, very explicit definitions were developed and disseminated to MEP/MIS staff. Two of the codes were created to identify students who received services during the summer. The codes are "B"--students who were served in both the regular 180 day school year AND the summer term and "S"--students that were served only in the summer term. The definition for summer services state that a student must be served in a Federally Funded (partially or fully) program designed (in whole or part) especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Students enrolled in a conventional summer school must, additionally or concurrently, be provided services that are fully or partially Federally Funded and designed especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Summer programs and services that are funded partially or fully by migrant program funds are clearly highlighted in district Migrant Education Program Project applications and are corroborated by district logs and reviewed during on-site district MEP monitoring visits. Districts have been provided guidance clarifying those children who receive instructional packets as a one-time act of providing instructional or support services cannot be included in their "summer count".

All students in Florida are assigned a unique, ten-digit Student Number Identifier, Florida (SID) number, consisting of the student's Social Security number followed by an 'X'. Those without Social Security numbers are assigned a SID by the local school district using a state defined methodology, which then becomes the student's State SID. Should a student move the receiving district is required to search the State's Student Locator system to determine if the student has prior enrollment history in any of Florida's public schools. If so, the SID which was originally assigned as the student's SID is to be assigned to the student in the receiving district. Please refer to: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0809/st262_1.pdf. Because the SID is unique to each student, further matching is not performed at the state level.

For this year's count, the following process was used: A master file containing all the students in the state was generated and the students that met the federal criteria were coded as 'Migrant'. A separate data file containing only migrant students served in Regular and Summer Sessions was generated. All records were matched and (unduplicated) by data element fields: Migrant Status Term, SID, District Number and School Number. Because of the uniqueness of each student's SID, there is an assurance that data are unique for each student based upon the Migrant Status Term data element and the Florida Student Number Identifier. By using the SID and Migrant Status Term and matching for duplicate SID's this methodology insures the data tables produce an unduplicated count for each session. When students are initially enrolled by district data staff, THEY must ensure that if a pre-existing SID is selected for a student, it must match on all variables, i.e.; name, DOB, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, home language, and parent names at a minimum before assigning a new SID.

An additional measure to ensure that districts do not generate a new SID for a student with an existing SID will be to disseminate extensive guidance to district MEP and district data staff on the nuances of Hispanic names and strongly encourage an in-depth probe of the State Student Locator system to identify such students before a new SID is issued.

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.

Same process was used to generate State's Category 2 count

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.

Since 2006, the FLDOE has established a Florida Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Office. The ID&R office includes a state ID&R Coordinator, a trainer, an administrative assistant and a data entry clerk. The ID&R office provides technical assistance and training to district MEPs on procedures and guidelines for eligibility, identification and recruitment; updating the procedures and forms (COEs) used by recruiters to meet accepted practices; and resolving questionable eligibility information on the COE forms with district MEP staff and other credible sources. The ID&R office also has updated the Florida ID&R Manual, developed a quality control document (which includes a COE checklist), modified the COE, provided new instructions for appropriate COE completion, and met with stakeholders and practitioners to develop and recommend eligibility policy to be accepted by the state.

The district MEPs have the responsibility of following the procedures and practices contained in the Florida ID&R Manual, developing a local Quality Control Plan, ensuring that staff is aware of the local Quality Control Plan, as well as the procedures and guidelines for ID&R in Florida, and participating in workshops and/or conferences conducted or sponsored by the SEA and/or the ID&R Office.

A new COE is generated for any new migrant child and existing COEs are updated annually for continued residency and age eligibility. Technical assistance is provided by the staff in the Florida Migrant Education Program Office or the ID&R Office, specializing in identification and recruitment procedures and practices to district and school-level migrant staff. Selected district MEPs are visited to ensure that the COEs are properly completed, reflect valid eligibility determinations and are submitted to local MIS offices for transmission to the State in a timely manner. This practice has been incorporated in annual, prescheduled monitoring activities for all Federal Programs, but remains a stand alone activity for MEP Programs (at the discretion of the State) in districts that may not be targeted for monitoring. The following Quality Control Procedures incorporate the steps the State will take to ensure the integrity of the eligibility determinations made by district MEPs and the accuracy of migrant child data collected and submitted as well as to address the outcomes of the Re-Interviewing Initiative:

 a. The initial eligibility determination of a student is made through face-to-face interviews with a parent, guardian, other responsible adult or an out of school youth traveling on his/her own.

 b. The SEA provides state-wide Identification and Recruitment training at least once a year to all staff. Training is provided more frequently to individual districts by request or by triggers that may surface during the annual district COE review. During these trainings, MEP definitions, interviewing skills, COE completion and quality control training are provided to enhance the level of knowledge of veteran and new staff. In 2010, three regional training events were conducted throughout the state to discuss the basic core of eligibility requirements, update on migrant policy from the state, review updates to the ID&R handbook, discuss updates to the COE, and review the new federal regulations and the potential impact on current ID&R procedures. In addition, over 15 site visits to districts were conducted to discuss ID&R and eligibility issues. Finally, ongoing communication via telephone and electronic mail is maintained with all districts.

 c. Florida, in collaboration with the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT) and the ID&R Office, continuously revises their Identification and Recruitment Handbook. The ID&R office posted the final copy in their website, www.flrecruiters.org. MEP staff is expected to follow the guidelines of the draft NRG along with all other guidance as disseminated by the Florida MEP.

 d. The COE was modified to facilitate the collection of information by recruiters and to align the items with similar forms used in other states. The COE reflects the changes and new regulations implemented by the OME. The 2010-2011 COE was delivered to districts in August, prior to the start of school. The form includes OME developed "Qualifying Move and Work" section required in all COEs. Based on the federal program regulations from 2009, the ID&R office provided guidance to districts regarding how to accurately complete the COE and document "economic necessity" and "temporary employment." The COE also includes a section to include specific information regarding OSY - last grade attended, where and when. Training on the use of this form was provided to districts during the 2010 Spring Regional Training events. To provide further assistance to districts and migrant staff, a presentation and a handout highlighting the key changes to the form were made available during the training and on the Florida Migrant Education Identification and Recruitment Office website at www.flrecruiter.org.

 e. The proper chain of command for resolving eligibility issues is that the recruiter brings the issue to local MEP staff and the Coordinator; if the issue is still unclear, the Coordinator can refer the issue to the state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. The state ID&R coordinator will research for similar situations and prior determinations that may facilitate a decision. Also, the ID&R coordinator will contact other districts as well as practitioners in other states who, in a confidential manner, will provide feedback. If a clear determination cannot be made, the issue is submitted to the Office of Migrant Education (OME). When possible, the FL-MEP will include the state's position or recommendation in the issue. The consensus of OME is shared with all local MEP staff.

 f. It is a standard operating procedure to verify the migrant child data extracted from the State student database with the migrant student data submitted at the district level. Files of these data are provided to districts for that purpose. Windows of opportunities to correct/revise/delete migrant child records are given to district MEPs to ensure that all students captured for state funding purposes are eligible migrant children.

 g. An e-newsletter is sent to recruitment staff across the state. Through the newsletter, recruiters and other migrant staff are kept informed of eligibility and policy guidance affecting the state. Also, the newsletter provides information on upcoming training events and resources from the field. Currently, there are over 225 migrant personnel registered to receive the newsletter. In addition, the ID&R office sends information to district migrant coordinators separately.

h. A COE database has been developed and implemented by the ID&R office. The database collects the information of every COE completed by recruiters in the state. The data clerk also serves as an extra quality control reviewer - prior to entry, every COE is reviewed and, when necessary, corrections and clarifications are requested to local districts. The ID&R office identifies "common trends" and uses the information to provide training to recruitment staff.

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.

Upon submission of the 2006 Re-Interview Initiative Report the FLDOE began the process of implementing the corrective actions described therein. The state has conducted statewide and regional training activities with recruitment staff regarding making proper eligibility determinations. In addition, LEAs were trained on how to corroborate information provided by families on the COEs. A state ID&R manual has been completed and disseminated, as well as a quality control document. An ID&R Office was established and staff was hired to specifically manage recruitment issues throughout the state. Staff from the ID&R office conducts multiple training events throughout the year to migrant staff. Significant changes to the COE were implemented, and key stakeholders were involved in recommending policy and guidance regarding eligibility to the state.

At the local level, key corrective actions have been implemented as well. Many LEAs have initiated local re-interview processes using the protocols, instructions, and forms developed by the state. The districts conduct re-interviews on an ongoing basis to validate eligibility determinations, particularly in situations where there is recently hired staff and unusual eligibility circumstances. The districts ensure that recruitment staff participates in all ID&R-related training provided by the state. In addition, the LEAs compiled a list of the major qualifying activities in their area, and this is information is maintained at the www.flrecruiter.org.

The districts also communicate, on a regular basis, with the ID&R office to discuss eligibility questions and review particular cases. Based on the number of questions received and the content of such questions, the ID&R Office provides guidance, through the e-newsletter, to clarify any ongoing issues related to eligibility determinations. In addition, the ID&R Office continuously schedules training with new staff at the districts.

Districts conduct rolling re-interview efforts to ensure that proper eligibility determinations are made. A re-interview form, instructions and protocol, developed by the ID&R office, are used in every local re-interview efforts conducted in the state. Districts are instructed to randomly select the sample for the re-interviews. If requested, the ID&R office can assist districts in conducting re-interviews.

When a re-interview indicates that a child or family are not eligible, the district must inform the SEA and the ID&R office, remove the child from the local and state database, and inform the family of the determination. Sample letters to inform families of the re-interview findings are provided in the ID&R office's website.

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 revised data element allows FDOE to produce preliminary reports and distribute these to school districts for further verification. Also, each District Migrant Coordinator is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the electronic records match the information on the COEs before the records are transmitted electronically to the State.

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 following verification process was used: A file broken down by LEA/district level containing student counts of all students reported in the data element Migrant Status Term code was sent to both MEP and MIS staff in each district on August 11, 2010. Two additional data runs and opportunities for correction (August 24, 2010 and September 10, 2010) were provided to districts prior to the final run. Districts had until October 1, 2010 (final run) to verify this data and submit any corrections to the SEA.

Districts were to use the file to verify the accuracy of data coded into the state student data base system. Both the district Migrant Coordinator and district MIS Directors were provided with these data files. FLDOE advised all district MEP and MIS staff to work collaboratively to ensure that the student counts were accurate, unduplicated and that each student record met the No Child Left Behind Act definition of a migrant student. School districts were allowed to make updates to their data up to the last possible moment to ensure the greatest degree of accuracy possible. Analysts in the Department then produced the final migrant student count on October 4, 2010 using the data set/file containing all corrections made by school districts during the verification phase.

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.

After increasing the number of districts participating in 2008's re-interview pilot, the FLDOE and the ID&R Office expanded their local rolling re-interview effort to include all districts in 2010. Districts were instructed to use the re-interview form, instructions and protocols developed

by the state. Previous efforts suggested that re-interviews are conducted at times when the families are in the area and take into consideration the size of the district and the number of children enrolled in the local program.

Customized training will be provided to districts based on the findings of the re-interview. Corrective actions will include:
- Increased visits by FLDOE/ID&R Office staff to specific districts;
- Accompany recruiters during ID&R efforts to identify errors, mistakes in interviewing techniques;
- Review of additional COEs to identify error patterns;
- Provide specific training to districts with high defect rates; and
- Conduct re-interviews with non-LEA personnel.

The ID&R office designed and implemented a COE database. The purpose of the database is to maintain information regarding qualifying moves, qualifying works and other eligibility related information. The database also serves as a quality control effort, since every form is reviewed by the data clerk.

A prospective re-interview was not conducted in 2010. However, the ID&R Office will start a re-interview process by conducting 2 efforts - spring and summer in school year 2010-2011. At least 100 re-interviews will be conducted. The COE database will be used to randomly select the re-interview sample.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The FLDOE Migrant Education Program is assured of the accuracy of the migrant child counts reported for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

ADDED DURING THE 09-10 PART I CSPR DATA VERIFICATION:

10.3.4 Reinterviewing procedures:
- How many COEs/determinations were extracted for the original sample during the reporting period? - How many COEs were selected for a reinterview from the original sample?
- How many reinterviews were completed from the original sample?
- How many COEs were replaced in order to conduct a sufficient number of reinterviews?

- How many of the reinterviews were with eligible families?

- What was the ratio of those sampled to those eligible?
- How many were non-responsive? (Family not available) - How many were determined ineligible?

RESPONSE: In 2009-2010, districts conducted rolling re-interviews to validate the eligibility determinations conducted by staff. The COEs in the sample were randomly selected from those completed in the current year (2009-10). A re-interview form, instructions and protocol is provided by the ID&R office (and available at www.flrecruiter.org).

How many COEs/determinations were extracted for the original sample during the reporting period?
RESPONSE: In 2009-2010, a total of 745 COEs were extracted during the reporting period.

How many COEs were selected for a re-interview from the original sample?
RESPONSE: From the original sample, 555 COEs were selected.

How many COEs were replaced in order to conduct a sufficient number of re-interviews?
RESPONSE: A total of 177 COEs had to be replaced. The replacements came from the original 745 COEs.

How many interviews were conducted (in total)?
RESPONSE: A total of 342 rolling re-interviews were conducted.

How many of the re-interviews were with eligible families?
RESPONSE: Of the total interviews, a total of 335 eligibility determinations were corroborated.

What was the ratio of those sampled to those eligible?
RESPONSE: 335:342 (98%)

How many were non-responsive? (Family not available to re-interview)
RESPONSE: Of the 555 attempts, a total of 234 were not responsive. These families either declined to be interviewed or the staff was unable to locate at home after 3 attempts.

How many were determined ineligible?
RESPONSE: Of the total interviewed, 7 COEs were determined not eligible (2%).

Districts are instructed to take the following actions when a COE is determined to be not eligible:
- Contact parent/child (if OSY) and notify of results from re-interview.
- Remove children from local database.
- Notify SEA to ensure child(ren) is/are removed from the state database.

- Send to ID&R office results of eligibility determination

- Send to ID&R office results of eligibility determination