

**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**  
**GEORGIA**



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

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part I, 2009-10	<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Georgia Department of Education		
Address: 205 Jesse Hill Jr. Dr. SE Atlanta, Georgia 30334		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Levette Williams		
Telephone: 404-463-6504		
Fax: 404-657-0501		
e-mail: <a href="mailto:lewillia@doe.k12.ga.us">lewillia@doe.k12.ga.us</a>		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. John D. Barge		
Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 4:43:45 PM		
Signature	Date	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

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

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards were made for the 2009-2010 school year.

In July 2010 Georgia adopted the Common Core State Standards in language arts and mathematics. A precision/alignment review is underway.

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

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards were made for the 2009-2010 school year.

In 2010-2011 Georgia will administer the Georgia Performance Standards-based Mathematics Georgia High School Graduation Test for the first time in spring 2011. Additionally, Georgia is implementing an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in grades 3 - 8 in reading, English/language-arts, and mathematics in spring 2011.

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

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	40.0
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	60.0
<b>Comments:</b> Estimation only; such information is not readily available.	

**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)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	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	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

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

**1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	865,157		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,068		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	28,572		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	325,717		>97
Hispanic	95,348		>97
White, non-Hispanic	388,827		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	99,789		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	44,472		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	493,458		>97
Migratory students	1,760		>97
Male	440,397		>97
Female	424,760		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	21,368	21.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	69,109	69.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,632	8.7
Total	99,109	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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	867,886		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,077		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	29,009	28,115	96.9
Black, non-Hispanic	326,600		>97
Hispanic	96,125		>97
White, non-Hispanic	389,357		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	100,125		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	45,856	43,093	94.0
Economically disadvantaged students	495,260		>97
Migratory students	1,811	1,710	94.4
Male	441,839		>97
Female	425,975		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	21,616	21.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	68,838	69.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,653	8.7
Total	99,107	
<b>Comments:</b> The difference is the result of the fact that two separate test are administered for Reading and Language Arts. Therefore these numbers have to be calculated and the difference is the result of rounding.		

### 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	865,204		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,068		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	28,570		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	325,751		>97
Hispanic	95,358		>97
White, non-Hispanic	388,838		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	99,776		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	44,479		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	493,495		>97
Migratory students	1,761		>97
Male	440,401		>97
Female	424,803		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	21,993	22.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	68,164	69.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,632	8.7
Total	98,789	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

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

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

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	131,138	104,977	80.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	277	233	84.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,409	4,064	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	48,374	33,759	69.8
Hispanic	17,218	13,677	79.4
White, non-Hispanic	56,672	49,768	87.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,417	8,675	56.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,841	9,735	75.8
Economically disadvantaged students	79,800	58,160	72.9
Migratory students	329	252	76.6
Male	67,207	52,363	77.9
Female	63,931	52,614	82.3
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported correctly.			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	131,023	119,254	91.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	278	260	93.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,302	4,127	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	48,335	41,601	86.1
Hispanic	17,095	15,481	90.6
White, non-Hispanic	56,673	53,778	94.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,416	11,468	74.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,548	11,099	88.5
Economically disadvantaged students	79,581	69,463	87.3
Migratory students	322	279	86.6
Male	67,036	59,412	88.6
Female	63,828	59,737	93.6
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported correctly.			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	131,026	105,748	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	277	234	84.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,409	3,996	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	48,336	33,341	69.0
Hispanic	17,200	13,631	79.2
White, non-Hispanic	56,621	50,993	90.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,403	9,695	62.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,831	9,581	74.7
Economically disadvantaged students	79,717	58,194	73.0
Migratory students	329	242	73.6
Male	67,143	52,956	78.9
Female	63,883	52,792	82.6
<b>Comments:</b> Data are reported correctly.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	128,948	99,793	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	312	249	79.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,253	3,921	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	47,934	31,096	64.9
Hispanic	15,572	11,969	76.9
White, non-Hispanic	57,019	49,399	86.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,312	7,490	48.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,982	7,062	70.7
Economically disadvantaged students	77,159	53,263	69.0
Migratory students	274	207	75.5
Male	66,019	50,522	76.5
Female	62,929	49,271	78.3
<b>Comments:</b> Data are reported correctly.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	128,881	114,102	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	312	277	88.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,175	3,965	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	47,901	39,676	82.8
Hispanic	15,472	13,445	86.9
White, non-Hispanic	57,001	53,092	93.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,312	9,951	65.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,730	8,014	82.4
Economically disadvantaged students	76,987	64,535	83.8
Migratory students	268	230	85.8
Male	65,895	56,539	85.8
Female	62,818	57,449	91.5
<b>Comments:</b> Data are reported correctly.			

## 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	128,812	102,441	79.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	312	258	82.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,251	3,883	91.3
Black, non-Hispanic	47,885	32,082	67.0
Hispanic	15,564	11,797	75.8
White, non-Hispanic	56,944	51,132	89.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,279	8,876	58.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,976	6,712	67.3
Economically disadvantaged students	77,071	54,699	71.0
Migratory students	273	197	72.2
Male	65,944	52,564	79.7
Female	62,868	49,877	79.3
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported correctly.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	127,284	112,629	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	240	88.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,993	3,842	96.2
Black, non-Hispanic	47,212	38,909	82.4
Hispanic	14,687	12,998	88.5
White, non-Hispanic	57,305	53,158	92.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,591	9,502	60.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,693	5,482	81.9
Economically disadvantaged students	75,289	62,978	83.6
Migratory students	300	243	81.0
Male	65,135	56,454	86.7
Female	62,149	56,175	90.4
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	127,209	118,439	93.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	253	93.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,914	3,780	96.6
Black, non-Hispanic	47,185	42,330	89.7
Hispanic	14,598	13,377	91.6
White, non-Hispanic	57,286	54,972	96.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,593	11,319	72.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,483	5,563	85.8
Economically disadvantaged students	75,124	67,726	90.2
Migratory students	292	248	84.9
Male	65,017	59,143	91.0
Female	62,046	59,198	95.4
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	127,145	98,812	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	228	84.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,990	3,550	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	47,163	30,792	65.3
Hispanic	14,683	10,608	72.2
White, non-Hispanic	57,229	50,447	88.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,566	8,323	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,696	3,759	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	75,210	51,587	68.6
Migratory students	300	183	61.0
Male	65,060	50,033	76.9
Female	62,085	48,779	78.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	124,614	94,015	75.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	312	243	77.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,104	3,733	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	47,101	29,789	63.2
Hispanic	13,640	10,128	74.3
White, non-Hispanic	55,994	47,365	84.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,553	6,323	43.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,698	2,746	58.5
Economically disadvantaged students	72,659	48,183	66.3
Migratory students	233	155	66.5
Male	63,777	47,289	74.1
Female	60,837	46,726	76.8
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	124,604	113,994	91.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	286	92.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,057	3,872	95.4
Black, non-Hispanic	47,089	41,474	88.1
Hispanic	13,555	12,123	89.4
White, non-Hispanic	55,991	52,917	94.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,556	9,802	67.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,523	3,497	77.3
Economically disadvantaged students	72,554	63,774	87.9
Migratory students	230	188	81.7
Male	63,693	56,457	88.6
Female	60,765	57,438	94.5
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	124,427	87,733	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	310	233	75.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,102	3,548	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	47,003	25,392	54.0
Hispanic	13,629	9,101	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	55,922	46,809	83.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,518	6,464	44.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,696	2,176	46.3
Economically disadvantaged students	72,518	42,755	59.0
Migratory students	233	139	59.7
Male	63,672	45,486	71.4
Female	60,755	42,247	69.5
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	120,727	103,718	85.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	323	275	85.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,067	3,847	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	45,474	35,762	78.6
Hispanic	12,702	10,874	85.6
White, non-Hispanic	54,820	49,958	91.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,778	7,832	56.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,106	2,967	72.3
Economically disadvantaged students	68,652	54,919	80.0
Migratory students	226	172	76.1
Male	61,525	51,346	83.5
Female	59,202	52,372	88.5
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	120,716	109,460	90.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	325	286	88.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,029	3,777	93.7
Black, non-Hispanic	45,465	39,498	86.9
Hispanic	12,597	11,131	88.4
White, non-Hispanic	54,816	51,531	94.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,775	8,851	64.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,932	2,809	71.4
Economically disadvantaged students	68,531	59,253	86.5
Migratory students	220	173	78.6
Male	61,461	53,891	87.7
Female	59,106	55,468	93.8
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

## 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	120,466	96,409	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	323	261	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,063	3,660	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic	45,358	31,533	69.5
Hispanic	12,685	9,656	76.1
White, non-Hispanic	54,705	48,444	88.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,714	6,895	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,099	2,167	52.9
Economically disadvantaged students	68,467	48,780	71.2
Migratory students	226	151	66.8
Male	61,356	48,185	78.5
Female	59,110	48,224	81.6
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	121,491	101,277	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	285	241	84.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,989	3,784	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	46,132	34,795	75.4
Hispanic	12,608	10,230	81.1
White, non-Hispanic	55,185	49,334	89.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,162	7,459	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,829	2,524	65.9
Economically disadvantaged students	67,958	51,857	76.3
Migratory students	267	205	76.8
Male	62,157	50,403	81.1
Female	59,334	50,874	85.7
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	121,468	114,635	94.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	287		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,954	3,755	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	46,113	42,577	92.3
Hispanic	12,506	11,520	92.1
White, non-Hispanic	55,168	53,234	96.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,172	10,552	74.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,667	2,864	78.1
Economically disadvantaged students	67,837	62,250	91.8
Migratory students	260	222	85.4
Male	62,057	57,415	92.5
Female	59,259	57,121	96.4
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	121,112	80,005	66.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	285	201	70.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,984	3,306	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	45,965	23,119	50.3
Hispanic	12,579	7,239	57.5
White, non-Hispanic	55,020	43,710	79.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,082	5,378	38.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,817	1,226	32.1
Economically disadvantaged students	67,680	36,173	53.4
Migratory students	267	112	41.9
Male	61,935	41,663	67.3
Female	59,177	38,342	64.8
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	108,767	78,920	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	283	213	75.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,691	3,341	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	42,403	24,789	58.5
Hispanic	8,698	6,004	69.0
White, non-Hispanic	51,066	42,539	83.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,296	3,593	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,209	1,110	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	50,546	31,154	61.6
Migratory students	126	70	55.6
Male	53,305	39,387	73.9
Female	55,462	39,533	71.3
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	108,883	97,886	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	284	255	89.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,698	3,454	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	42,478	36,242	85.3
Hispanic	8,723	7,529	86.3
White, non-Hispanic	51,080	47,948	93.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,290	5,918	57.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,216	1,454	65.6
Economically disadvantaged students	50,641	42,869	84.7
Migratory students	126	87	69.0
Male	53,389	46,829	87.7
Female	55,494	51,057	92.0
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	108,812	97,804	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	258	90.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,698	3,549	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic	42,487	35,622	83.8
Hispanic	8,709	7,570	86.9
White, non-Hispanic	51,016	48,360	94.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,227	6,375	62.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,224	1,596	71.8
Economically disadvantaged students	50,603	42,906	84.8
Migratory students	127	96	75.6
Male	53,270	47,825	89.8
Female	55,542	49,979	90.0
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported accurately.			

**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	2,221	1,718	77.4
Districts	186	47	25.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	1,503	1,132	75.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,247	953	76.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	256	179	69.9
<b>Comments:</b> This number represents all Title I schools.			

**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
185	47	25.4
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

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

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	85
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	
<b>Comments:</b> The blanks represents zero and EDEN Partner Support indicated that this was acceptable.	

**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	43
<b>Comments:</b> The blanks represents zero and EDEN Partner Support indicated that this was acceptable.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to address the problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action, the Georgia Department of Education initiated the following:

1. The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) provided the services of School Improvement Specialists (with expertise in analysis and planning) for NI Systems. These specialists met with the appropriate school district staff responsible for improvement on a periodic basis throughout the year. The specialists initially worked with the district personnel to ensure that the districts had developed viable improvement plans and that the plans adequately addressed the data issues within the system that had significant impact on AYP. Guidance was provided via the System Fieldbook, which had specific directions for completing the Comprehensive LEA Improvement Plans (CLIP). They assisted the school systems in the development and/or revision of these plans (CLIP). During the year, the GaDOE specialists met with system personnel to check progress in the implementation of these plans and offer suggestions on implementation issues that may have been encountered. In the case of districts in Corrective Action, Guidance was provided in the System Fieldbook for the development of addenda to the CLIP (LEA Corrective Action Addendum). The assigned school improvement specialists assisted the district personnel in the development of the LEA Corrective Action Addendum and conducted follow-up visits to check progress and address implementation issues.
2. The Georgia Department of Education provided Title I School Improvement Grants (1003 (a) and 1003 (g) for schools within the systems that were in needs improvement. These grants were to be used to fund the school improvement plans for the Title I NI schools within the systems.
3. The Georgia Department of Education provided school improvement support services for schools within the system:
  - a. For schools in NI 1-2, school improvement services were provided by a RESA School Improvement Specialist
  - b. For schools in NI 3-4, school improvement services were provided by GaDOE School Improvement Specialists
  - c. For schools in NI 5 and higher, school improvement services were provided by a GaDOE State Director, who assisted the schools in implementing the terms of an improvement contract. In cases of schools in NI levels 7 and higher during 2009-2010, the ratio of State Directors to schools was 1:1.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

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

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	3
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0

**Comments:** Under the federally-approved Differentiated Accountability Plan, the Corrective Action options for Georgia districts do not exactly match those in the CSPR document.

Three districts were in Corrective Action in 2009-2010 (Clayton County, Muscogee County, and Gordon County.)

1. Clayton County School District chose option #4 and option #6 in the list below.
2. Muscogee County School District chose option #4 in the list below.
3. Gordon County School District chose option #4 in the list below.

Under the federally-approved Differentiated Accountability Plan, the Corrective Action options for Georgia districts were as follows:

1. Deferment of program funds or reduction of administrative funds, or
2. Replacement of LEA personnel who are relevant to the failure of the LEA to make adequate yearly progress, or
3. Removal of particular schools from the jurisdiction of the LEA and establishing alternative arrangements for public governance and supervision of such schools or,
4. Any such corrective action prescribed by the GaDOE that directly impacts factors identified as keeping the LEA from making adequate yearly progress, or
5. Authorization for students to transfer from a school operated by the LEA to a higher performing public school operated by another LEA and providing transportation in accordance with federal law, in conjunction with not less than one other corrective action from the above list, or
6. Institutionalization and full implementation of a new curriculum that is based on State and local academic content and achievement standards, including providing appropriate professional development based on scientifically-based research for all relevant staff, and offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students.

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	4	3
Schools	175	57
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	83,201	80,742
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	56,847	54,280
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	68.3	67.2
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	85,910	82,671
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	73,477	69,925
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	85.5	84.6
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	83
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	48
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	130
<b>Comments:</b>	

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 10/15/10  
data was complete



### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy (s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
5	Short Term Action Plan and Monitoring Process - In NI 5 and above schools, a process was implemented whereby manageable parts of the school improvement plan were targeted for implementation on a 45-60 day cycle. Each period, the degree and impact of implementation was monitored formally by lead state directors. Determinations were made as to what needed more work and the plan was re-cycled for the next period.	43	13	8	D	The short term action plan format systematizes the approach to monitoring of the improvement interventions in a school. Increased accountability and responsibility for the work is another product of this approach. The STAP enables a school to do fewer things better and see real results with specific interventions.
2	Observations with Feedback	215	43	37	D	Credibility and trust is heightened when GaDOE specialist can demonstrate research-based practices and help teachers to identify areas for improvement through focused observations and timely, descriptive feedback.
						Clarity of expectations and an intensified sense of accountability are effects of the use of an improvement contract. Entering into an

3	Improvement Contract	43	13	8	A	agreement also helps to create an improvement collaborative between the SEA and LEA and school.
4	Professional Learning	215	43	37	D	Focused professional learning is correlated to the needs of the students in NI schools.
1	GAPSS Analysis	24	0	2	A	Participation in a GAPSS Analysis familiarizes the entire school faculty with the School Keys (Georgia's school performance standards). The process gives a tight focus to the improvement efforts in the school. GAPSS data helps a school leadership team to work "smarter." School Keys, measured by the GAPSS Analysis, is correlated with Leader Keys and with CLASS Keys.

**Comments:** Data entered.

**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.

Georgia has developed and implemented school standards (School Keys: Unlocking Excellence through the Georgia School Standards) to describe what Georgia's schools need to know, understand, and be able to do. The Georgia school standards are the foundation for Georgia's comprehensive, data-driven system of school improvement and support.

Through the Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards (GAPSS) diagnostic process, a variety of data are collected from multiple sources to assess the status of a school on each of the standards. The data are combined to inform the results of the GAPSS analysis, which, in turn, informs the development and implementation of school improvement initiatives. A companion resource is the Implementation Resource (IR) which is a collection of best practices that support implementation of the school standards.

Georgia's statewide system of support includes the use of school improvement specialists and state directors serving schools in Needs Improvement status. It is the responsibility of the school improvement specialists and state directors to share effective strategies, provide support with implementation of the strategies, and monitor implementation of the strategies. In addition, lead school improvement specialists and lead state directors monitor school improvement specialists and state directors and provide support to schools through the short-term action planning process.

The Division of School Improvement offers a range of professional learning opportunities that support implementation of effective school improvement strategies.

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The use of Title I, Part A, 1003(g) funds falls into two categories.

1. Salaries for state directors.
2. School Improvement Grants

State directors are the link from the Georgia Department of Education to the Needs Improvement school for technical assistance. The state directed status, created by the federally approved Differentiated Accountability Plan, is guided by an improvement contract. The state director, who is assigned to a state directed school on a full time basis, serves to ensure that the elements of the improvement contract are carried out. Technical assistance is given in the areas of:

- replacement of staff
- implementation of curriculum frameworks
- administration of benchmark assessments
- implementation of short-term action plans
- analysis of teacher attendance data
- analysis of student attendance data
- analysis of discipline data
- target areas from the GAPSS analysis
- CLASS Keys teacher evaluation system
- participation and follow through with expectations of required professional learning

The school improvement grants are provided in order to support school with implementing their school improvement initiatives, in effect, funding the school improvement plans. State directors and Atlanta staff provide assistance as needed to help school ensure alignment between the plans for expending grant funds and the content of the school improvement plan. Periodic monitoring of the school improvement grant expenditures is done by state directors and other GaDOE School Improvement field staff.

**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 GAPSS analyses that are conducted for Needs Improvement schools are not funded by Title I, Part A, 1003(a) or 1003(g). These GAPSS analyses were coordinated by state-paid school improvement specialists with special expertise in the GAPSS analysis process.

Another action supported by funds other than Title I, Part A, 1003(a) or 1003(g) funds is the technical support of NI1 through NI 4 schools by state-paid school improvement specialists.

Finally, Atlanta office positions are funded with state funds to support the work of school improvement.

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	50,427
Applied to transfer	6,324
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	6,017
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 14,535,299

**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
	73

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	117,965
Applied for supplemental educational services	17,928
Received supplemental educational services	13,417
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 18,960,180
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	278,723	272,739	97.9	5,984	2.1
All elementary classes	90,820	89,435	98.5	1,385	1.5
All secondary classes	187,903	183,304	97.6	4,599	2.4

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.

Yes the state does count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary Details: hiq_year status_description Percent 2010 Ambiguous coding 0.3% 2010 Not HiQ - certificate condition 0.6% 2010 Not HiQ - certificate OK, lacks tests 11.9% 2010 Not HiQ - no appropriate certificate or test 45.3% 2010 Not HiQ - not certified 3.4% 2010 Not HiQ - over 3 years on "not professional" NT 12.6% 2010 Not HiQ - test OK, lacks certificate 25.8% 2010 Total 100.0%
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary Information hiq_year status_description Percent 2010 Ambiguous coding 0.1% 2010 Not HiQ - certificate condition 1.5% 2010 Not HiQ - certificate OK, lacks tests 13.8% 2010 Not HiQ - no appropriate certificate or test 41.8% 2010 Not HiQ - not certified 1.7% 2010 Not HiQ - over 3 years on "not professional" NT 24.7% 2010 Not HiQ - test OK, lacks certificate 16.4% 2010 Total 100.0%
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 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	23,523	22,753	96.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	25,504	25,251	99.0
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	30,593	28,794	94.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	62,041	61,223	98.7
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	74.6	39.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price Lunch Data	
Secondary schools	76.1	42.2
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price lunch data	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although dual language programs are not widely implemented in Georgia at this time, the number of programs is slowly increasing. Dual language programs have been developed and implemented both in charter schools and traditional public schools in Georgia and while these programs are expanding annually, other LEAs are expressing interest in pursuing the implementation of dual language as a program model. LEA also utilize the Push-In model which allows the ESOL teacher to enter the regular education classroom and work directly with ELLS, providing language support in the content classroom. A significant number of LEAs have provided teachers with SIOP training to ensure that academic content material taught in the classroom is comprehensible to ELLS and to promote development of English language proficiency. SIOP training provides teachers with a well articulated and practical method of sheltered instruction to facilitate high quality instruction for ELLS in content areas.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	85,410
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

#	
LEP	
students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	73,814
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	66,955
No linguistic content; Not applicable	4,207
Vietnamese	2,412
Korean	1,812
Chinese	1,284

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category "No linguistic content" listed above as the second most commonly spoken language represents Georgia LEP students who speak languages categorized as "Other African", "Other Asian", "Other Indian", "Other European". The Georgia language code individually lists the primary languages in each group spoken by Georgia LEP students, but does not separately list every individual language within those categories. Other major language groups represented in Georgia are French (948), "Amharic, Tigrinya, Tigre" (799),Gujarati (700) and Portuguese (589).

### 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	78,120
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	7,290
Total	85,410
<p><b>Comments:</b> Only K-12 English Language Learners, coded ELL-Y, are included in the total count of LEP students tested on the annual state ELP assessment. Students are coded ELL-Y (LEP-Y) upon determination of eligibility and remain coded as such until their status changes to ELL-M (LEP-M). ACCESS for ELLs is the annual ELP assessment. In Georgia, it is administered during a specific testing window between late January and the beginning of March (1/19/10-3/1/10). Students who enter Georgia schools outside the ACCESS testing window dates are reported as ELL-Y upon screening and meeting eligibility requirements; however, if they are not enrolled during the ELP testing window, the ACCESS cannot be administered to them. Because the population is highly mobile, a significant number of ELLs may miss the testing window while still being included in the total count of LEP students in the state for the school year.</p>	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	12,819
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.4
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	68,178
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,636
Total	73,814
<b>Comments:</b> The number tested on the State annual ELP assessment includes all Title III LEP students who participated in one or more domains of the assessment. This number includes students with disabilities of a nature that may have prevented their participation in all domains of the assessment. This includes students who are blind and unable to see a picture and describe it for the speaking domain or students who are deaf or whose hearing is so severely impaired that they are not able to respond to oral questions in the listening domain. Students who have the most severe cognitive disabilities may only be able to participate in certain domains of the assessment due to the nature and severity of their disabilities. Students whose student booklets indicated they were absent for one or more domains of the assessment, students who moved out of state without completing the entire assessment and students who participated in one or more domains of the assessment, but were absent for others because of medical emergencies also were included in the total.	
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.	21,826

**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	35,102	75.7	22,712	49.00
Attained proficiency	10,888	16.0	4,091	6.00
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> Georgia provides content testing in English only.	

**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:**

**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)
None
None

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

**Language(s)**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

**Comments:**

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
10,559	10,752	21,311
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,846	13,397	90.2	1,449
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,846	14,297	96.3	549
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,693	12,354	84.1	2,339
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	91
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	81
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	90
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	89
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	82
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	3
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	1

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:** Georgia has a single state-wide consortium comprised of 79 LEAs reporting ELLS but with a population too small to qualify for a Title III allocation. The 79 districts are located geographically throughout the entire state. The Georgia Title III Consortium is considered a single subgrantee and AMAOs 1 and 2 are calculated for the consortium as a single entity. AMAO 3 is calculated individually for each LEA within the consortium. In 2009-10 no LEA in the consortium had a qualifying subgroup for AYP Academic Achievement calculations. Reporting any LEA with "too few for subgroup" as not meeting AMAO 3 would unjustly penalize the LEA because of its small demographic population; therefore, Georgia LEAs with "too few for subgroup" designations are considered to meet AMAO 3.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
25,109	6,462	29

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,072
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	350

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.

Despite the current economic recession in Georgia, from 2008-09 to 2009-10 the ELL K-12 population in the state increased slightly more than 5%. While fewer new families are moving into Georgia for work reasons at this time, Georgia is designated as a key refugee location center and therefore, will continue to experience annual increases in the ELL student population. Additionally, the largest population of ELLs entering Georgia public schools is at the Kindergarten level; many of those future public school students are already living in the state. This trend is expected to continue as children of families who have made their homes in Georgia reach school age and enroll in local schools.

The estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers needed for Title III language instruction is based on the expectation that the total ELL student population will continue to grow by approximately 3% to 5% per year or approximately 15,000 students over the next five years. Additionally, more LEAs are incorporating sheltered content instruction classes for ELLs into local school schedules to better serve the academic needs of ELL students. The number of additional certified/licensed teachers, 350, resulted from dividing 15,000 new students by 42, the number of students the state funding formula anticipates being assigned to a teacher.

Georgia Department of Education Title III and Title I programs have collaborated to offer on-line ESOL Endorsement opportunities to districts in rural areas as availability of endorsement programs is often limited to more populous areas of the state. A number of the larger school districts and Regional Education Service Agencies (RESAs) also offer ESOL training as part of their professional learning programs. Several state universities offer either the ESOL Endorsement or full ESOL teacher certification programs.

\* 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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	77	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	76	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	69	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	70	
Other (Explain in comment box)	46	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	82	33,913
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	81	3,404
PD provided to principals	71	1,128
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	79	1,908
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	61	2,801
PD provided to community based organization personnel	28	7,091
Total	91	50,245

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other" category encompasses subgrantees that had teachers or administrators enrolled in the Georgia ESOL Endorsement course sequence offered in an approved program through their local school district, a Regional Education Services Agency (RESA) or a college or university. It also includes subgrantees that offered SIOP training, and a variety of other topics related to ELLs, including supporting ELLs in the classroom, differentiation for ELLs, ELLs and Special Education services, awareness and respect for cultural differences, the role of cultural differences in ELL instruction, and RTI with a specific focus on ELLs.

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

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

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

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

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

**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
07/10/09	08/13/09	34
<p><b>Comments:</b> The Georgia State Board of Education approves all grant awards to local school systems. The Georgia Department of Education Title III Unit received its initial notification of the Title III allocation from the ED Title III Program Officer on July 10, 2009. State Board of Education procedures do not permit approval of allocations prior to receipt of the exact dollar amount of the allocation. The Georgia SBOE met on August 13, 2009 and approved the grant awards as part of the meeting agenda.</p>		

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.

We have taken a proactive approach, preparing an item for information for the State Board of Education prior to receiving the grant award. This is not standard operating procedure and does not guarantee that grant funds will be made available more quickly, but does ensure that the State Board of Education has all pertinent information regarding the Title III grant and will be ready to approve the item at their first meeting following receipt of the grant award. Funds may not be distributed until formal approval of the amount is granted by the State Board of Education.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools <b>Comments:</b> There are no Persistently Dangerous school in Georgia. EDEN Partner Support confirmed that a blank represents zero.	

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	78.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	80.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	74.2
Hispanic	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	82.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	41.4
Limited English proficient	55.0
Economically disadvantaged	72.9
Migratory students	49.2
Male	75.5
Female	82.3
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported correctly.	

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
  - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

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

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	3.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	<3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	4.7
Hispanic	4.2
White, non-Hispanic	3.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5.8
Limited English proficient	4.3
Economically disadvantaged	4.0
Migratory students	3.9
Male	4.6
Female	3.1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

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

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

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	136	136
LEAs with subgrants	45	45
Total	181	181
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
	Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	110
K	575	2,133
1	528	2,113
2	481	2,054
3	545	2,054
4	447	1,851
5	381	1,797
6	367	1,593
7	328	1,352
8	348	1,533
9	322	1,753
10	198	1,132
11	120	868
12	165	842
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total	4,915	21,513

**Comments:** The total number of students enrolled in section 1.9.1.1 does not equal the number of students in section 1.9.2.2 due to removing "Other" as a subgroup category on the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey.

**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	266	2,390
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,367	16,854
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	28	168
Hotels/Motels	254	2,101
Total	4,915	21,513

**Comments:** This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey. All grantees reported data. The total number of students enrolled in section 1.9.1.1 does not equal the number of students in section 1.9.2.2 due to removing "Other" as a subgroup category on the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey.

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	438
K	2,133
1	2,113
2	2,054
3	2,054
4	1,851
5	1,797
6	1,593
7	1,352
8	1,533
9	1,753
10	1,132
11	868
12	842
Ungraded	
Total	21,513
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	521
Migratory children/youth	84
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,205
Limited English proficient students	1,367
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	44
Expedited evaluations	27
Staff professional development and awareness	44
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	40
Transportation	43
Early childhood programs	28
Assistance with participation in school programs	39
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	42
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	36
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	43
Coordination between schools and agencies	42
Counseling	36
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	31
Clothing to meet a school requirement	37
School supplies	44
Referral to other programs and services	40
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	36
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.

This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey. All grantees reported data.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	7
School Selection	9
Transportation	26
School records	12
Immunizations	10
Other medical records	7
Other Barriers – in comment box below	11

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Barriers included:

- Funding for food and clothing beyond emergency situations and additional personnel
  - Apathy of parents toward school and grades. Legal guardianship requirements, residency requirements, and birth certificates
  - Lack of jobs and affordable housing in our district contributes to the instability of families which ultimately impacts the success of students
- This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey. All grantees reported data.

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	2,045	1,750
4	1,800	1,460
5	1,726	1,526
6	1,526	1,315
7	1,281	1,031
8	1,410	1,255
High School	877	711
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment**

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	2,060	1,428
4	1,809	1,162
5	1,736	1,393
6	1,536	950
7	1,289	930
8	1,419	976
High School	877	488
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	882
K	904
1	513
2	484
3	467
4	403
5	358
6	343
7	302
8	304
9	306
10	247
11	183
12	163
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	3,166
Total	9,031
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease is less than 10%.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	201
K	327
1	188
2	185
3	162
4	133
5	123
6	91
7	73
8	63
9	25
10	22
11	17
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	27
Total	1,637
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The increase is less than 10%.

**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEstar was used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. The child counts for the last reporting period were also generated using the COEstar system.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Note: This information pertains to both the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Upon enrollment in the Migrant Education Program (MEP), information from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is entered into COEstar by a trained Georgia Department of Education Migrant Education Agency (MEA) data specialist.

Data on the COE include:

- (1) Family data (parent/guardian name(s), family language, current address, and home base)
- (2) Child data (name, sex, race, date of birth, birthplace, school, grade, and school enrollment date)
- (3) Eligibility data (where moved from, where moved to, with/to join or on his/her own move, date of move, qualifying worker, qualifying activity, employer, whether work is seasonal or temporary, whether work is agricultural or fishing related, whether move was for economic necessity)
- (4) Residency date
- (5) Comments explaining migrant work history and qualifying activity as identified in the eligibility section
- (6) Other data (previous school enrollments, etc.)
- (7) Parent/Guardian and recruiter signatures

All of the above information is obtained through a face-to-face interview with the family/self-eligible youth, generally at their residence or workplace by a trained regional MEA office recruiter/employee or a trained local education agency (LEA) migrant staff person. Occasionally, the family interview occurs when parents come to the school to register their children. In all cases, the COE is completed and submitted to the appropriate regional MEA office for processing.

COEs are completed on each new family/self-eligible youth identified by the MEA recruiter/employee or LEA staff during the initial interview. Identification and recruitment (ID&R) activities are carried out year round. Occasionally, ID&R activities are conducted as a part of other MEA or LEA activities, e.g. summer festivals, migrant health fairs.

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 state employs a single full-time MEP state data collections coordinator, and two full-time state data specialists. The three state MEA regional offices each have their own full-time data specialists.

The primary responsibility of the state data collections coordinator and her team is to maintain/monitor the statewide data system and data collection process, update the data in COEstar and the national migrant student information exchange (MSIX) system, as well as generate reports and queries as requested by the state and the LEAs.

Every day, the data specialists from each of the three MEA regional offices send electronic copies of their COEstar database to a full-time state data specialist (each regional office has a complete statewide copy of the COEstar database). The state data specialist synchronizes each copy, running checks to identify and catch any duplication, errors, and/or missing data. If problems with the data are detected, the state data specialist sends an e-mail to the appropriate MEA data specialist, the appropriate MEA coordinator, and the state data collections coordinator, explaining the problem or concern. When the MEA data specialist has corrected the problem or addressed the concern, she sends a secure e-mail with the corrections to inform the state data specialist, the MEA coordinator, and the state data collections coordinator that the problematic data have been corrected, if applicable. When this review process is complete, the state data specialist then uploads an updated, corrected copy of the COEstar database to each MEA data specialist.

Because each regional MEA office and the state data collections office have complete copies of the COEstar database, many errors and duplicates are caught at the regional level. Each month the state data collections coordinator prepares a performance report to provide an overview of every aspect of the COEstar database for the state program director. If the state program director sees any problems, these are communicated by e-mail to the state data collections coordinator for resolution.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for both counts were collected and maintained using the same set of procedures. Although Category 2 data are collected and maintained in the same way as Category 1, the State provides training annually to all migrant staff on what allowable services may be appropriately associated with the Category 2 count. Such training focuses on ensuring that only services that meet the U. S. Department of Education's definition are those associated with the child count. The services data are also reviewed by data specialists for appropriateness before the data are entered into the COEstar system.





**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 Georgia Department of Education Migrant Education Program uses the following processes to calculate each child count:

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)

Response: COEstar is programmed to produce a count based on all the eligibility criteria contained in the federal statute.

Children who were resident in your State for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/1-8/31)

Response: COEstar's Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the state during the period. These include checking the school year listed on school enrollment records, the qualifying arrival date (QAD), residency dates, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, departure dates, LEP, needs assessment, graduation/termination dates, special services dates, and health record dates performed in the state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if departure dates indicate that they left before the period began, or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the state when the period began.

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

Response: Each summer or intersession term, the local project director forwards a report to the regional MEA office containing the number of eligible migrant children or youth who received services (instructional or support) at least one day during the summer or intersession term. The data regarding the particulars of the services are entered into the individual student's information/school history line in COEstar.

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

Response: The state data collections coordinator runs COEstar's Performance Reporter, which has a number of programmed interventions to count migrant children only once, state wide, for the period specified in the state data collections coordinator query. Some of these interventions include checking names that are the same or similar, checking the maiden name of the child's mother, and

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count was generated using the same system as the Category 1 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.

It is the goal of the Georgia MEP to achieve and maintain 100% accuracy in its recruiting processes. Important quality control steps and processes have been implemented in recent years at the MEA and state levels to improve the GaDOE's ability to ensure and verify the accuracy of eligibility determinations prior to or immediately after entering eligibility information in the COEstar system. They are:

#### Ongoing Recruiter Training

All MEA and LEA migrant staff members are provided mandatory ID&R training, where agendas and sign-in sheets are maintained, throughout the year. They attend training on:

- The Migrant Education Program
- The Identification and Recruitment Handbook
- How to apply the eligibility section of the Non-Regulatory Guidance
- The role of recruitment
- How to conduct interviews
- How to fill out a COE
- Effective recruitment techniques
- How to resolve difficult recruitment cases
- Records maintenance/documentation

All program staff members (including LEA migrant funded staff) are required to attend these training sessions. They are required to pass a series of assessments to certify their understanding of the state's recruiting policies and guidelines. Passing scores are mandatory in order to receive a satisfactory annual evaluation from program administrators. All state full-time recruiters are required to meet at least once every quarter with the state ID&R coordinator to review any change in guidelines, discuss policies and procedures, and to discuss and resolve difficult or ambiguous recruitment cases. All newly hired recruiting staff, whether at the local or state level, participates in an initial three day recruitment training session prior to beginning any recruitment effort for the state. All new recruiters also have all their paperwork fully screened by an experienced recruiter until they successfully complete at least ten enrollments with no errors that would require follow up with the families.

#### Certificate of Eligibility (COE) Processing

Statewide uniformity at the MEA level in processing COEs for data system entry is as follows:

MEA and local recruiters/employee recruit families or youth by completing a COE during a face-to-face interview.

Written information recorded during the interview is verbally reviewed by the recruiter/employee for accuracy. The recruiter/employee then signs the form and asks the interviewee to sign, as well.

The pink copy is immediately given to the interviewee as a record of the eligibility interview.

The original copy (white), along with the recruiter or LEA copy (yellow) go to the regional data specialist.

The COE is date stamped by the data specialist upon arrival at the regional MEA office.

The MEA data specialist reviews the COE for completion to ensure that all boxes are marked and that the COE is filled out according to the state's completion instructions as described in the GaDOE MEP ID&R Handbook (2007 Edition).

If the COE meets all of the necessary criteria, the data specialist initials it in the top right hand corner. It is then given to the regional MEA office coordinator for final review and approval.

If the data specialist sees that an item is missing or believes that an item needs clarification, she records the date and concern(s) in a log, retains a copy of the COE, and returns the original white and yellow copy to the recruiter/employee who conducted the interview. The request is made in writing that the recruiter/employee correct and/or provide additional comments or corrections. The recruiter/employee is required to go back to the family for any additional information and both must initial the changes on the form. A data specialist can correct and initial spelling mistakes without having to notify the recruiter or family/youth.

As mentioned, the data specialist maintains a list of concerns that are encountered, and the name of the recruiter/employee submitting the COE in question. This assists in monitoring errors as they arise. The regional MEA office is responsible for (1) resolving outstanding issues/discrepancies and (2) providing feedback and training to individual recruiters as the need arises.

All COEs receive regional MEA office coordinator verification and approval prior to being entered into the COEstar system. A signature line is included on the original and yellow copy of the COE for this purpose.

After errors and discrepancies are resolved and the coordinator has signed off, the information on the COE is entered into the COEstar system.

The original COE (white) and the electronic COE are maintained at the regional MEA office.

The yellow copy is sent to the original interviewer.

A COEstar generated notification or "Friendly COE" form is mailed to the LEA after its approval to provide systems with basic program eligibility information.

The data specialists and recruiters/employees work as a team. They consult with each other to resolve issues and answer questions that may arise. If there are issues that the data specialists and recruiters/employees are unable to resolve independently, they will consult with the regional MEA office coordinators immediately to resolve the issues.

Any issues, which the region is unable to resolve independently, are referred to the state ID & R coordinator. If at any time the state ID & R coordinator is unable to answer the question, it is referred to the Migrant Education Office within the United States Department of Education in Washington, DC for assistance.

Should a question arise from any source regarding an eligibility determination made on a child, the state takes action on the question or concern by requesting a re-interview. The form that is utilized is the same as that used in the random sample prospective re-interview process and is available from the State MEP Data Collections Office. The process for evaluating the eligibility determination follows that of the prospective re-interview process.

The state, itself, is solely responsible for reviewing and monitoring the quality of its migrant student eligibility documentation as it relates to the annual child count, including student eligibility data related to attendance in regular year and summer/intersession projects. All eligibility decisions are finalized and made by the coordinator in each of the state's regional MEA offices prior to the delivery of any MEP services. Every child's eligibility documentation is included for selection in the random sample process associated with the quality control efforts of the state's prospective re-interviews.

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.

#### I. Paperwork Preparation and Staff Assignment Process

The State Data Collections Office generates random samples on a quarterly basis. Once the COEs are sampled for a selected time period:

- The MEA data specialists make photocopies of the original paper COE corresponding to each COE selected. She then completes the top section of a verification form. The COE copy is placed in an envelope and sealed. The outside of the envelope is marked with the information deemed necessary for the re-interviewer to see prior to conducting the interview (E.g. COE number, re-interviewee name, and whether to check for prior moves). The verification form is attached to the envelope and is then given to the regional MEA coordinator for dissemination to re-interviewers.
- The regional MEA coordinator selects the most appropriate re-interviewer (regional MEA recruiter) for the verification of eligibility interview. It is expected that the verification will be done by a trained re-interviewer different than the original interviewer.
- The MEA data specialist maintains a log of who is in charge of completing the verification of each COE for the regional MEA office.

#### II. Conducting the Verification Process in the Field

All eligibility re-interviewing MUST be done through a face-to-face interview with the original interviewee, wherever possible. The re-interviewer completing the verification of eligibility may only use phone calls to set up appointments. Re-interviewers give priority to scheduling summer school students during the summer quarter.

On the day of the verification, the re-interviewer in charge can be accompanied by another recruiter or LEA staff member to assist in locating families. If that individual was the original interviewer, he or she must return to or remain in the car prior to and/or during the re-interview.

The re-interviewer completing the verification will explain, in a positive manner, the reason why this quality control measure is taking place. Each field of the verification form in sections IV and V must be completed by the re-interviewer. If one of the fields does not apply, a N/A notation will be used.

The re-interviewer is free to paraphrase any of the questions in order to clarify the meaning of a question to the family, but must not use any leading questions.

The paper copy of the COE will be in a sealed envelope, with relevant info on the outside. The copy of the COE is available only for verification purposes, to be used following completion of the re-interview. The re-interviewer must not refer to previously recorded facts or show the paper copy of the COE to the family during the re-interview. The re-interviewer should open the sealed envelope only after the re-interview is complete to cross check it with the re-interview data, and ask any needed follow-up questions.

At the end of the visit, the re-interviewer will verbally review the data entered on the verification form with the interviewee and will date and sign the form along with the interviewee.

If the interviewee is unable to write or sign, a witnessed mark can take the place of the signature.

If the interviewee refuses to sign, the re-interviewer will make a notation of it and the reason, if any reason is given. The lack of a signature will have no impact on eligibility or ineligibility and the verification will still be considered valid.

If it is determined that a family has departed, the re-interviewer will document who provided the information using a comment such as: "Departed per aunt, neighbor, etc." The re-interviewer will sign and date the verification form and move to the next COE from the random sample.

If the re-interviewer finds an interviewee not at home, he or she will make at least three attempts to locate or meet with the individual. Each attempt will take place at different dates and hours of the day and each one will be documented in the top section of the verification form. After the third attempt, the re-interviewer will circle the last visit documentation notation. The re-interviewer will then enter a comment such as: "3 attempts-unable to locate," on the space provided for the parent's signature. The re-interviewer will sign and date the verification

form.

The re-interviewer in charge of the eligibility verification will have until 14 days after the start of the re-interview period to deliver the

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP

completed forms to the respective regional MEA coordinator.

The regional MEA coordinator will review each of the eligibility verifications to ensure that it is complete and accurate. The MEA coordinator will discuss any questions or incomplete information with the re-interviewer completing the verification.

### III. Completing Final Paperwork

The MEA data specialist will use the electronic spreadsheet for her region contained in the state's "Quarterly Quality Control" (QQC) Excel document to enter the results of the re-interviews. Information will be entered for each randomly selected COE used during the Quarterly Quality Control process, whether the verification attempt was successful or not. This Excel document will be sent as an electronic e-mail attachment to the state ID&R coordinator and the state data collections coordinator by the first Friday of the month after the QQC took place.

The regional data specialists will compile a folder that contains the following completed documents:

- A hard copy of the "Quarterly Quality Control" Excel document, acting as a cover page
- Photocopies of each of the verified paper COEs attached to the back of its respective verification form

Each verification form will be numbered in the top right corner, in the order in which they were entered in the electronic spreadsheet.

Copies of the paper COEs and the verification forms will be mailed to the state ID&R coordinator no later than seven working days after the end of the QQC period. The original folder will be filed and available for audit at the regional office.

The MEA data specialist will prepare the letters to notify any misidentified families by mail by the beginning of the second week of the month after the QQC took place. To allow for an appeals process, if there is concern about the eligibility re-determination, any party with a legitimate interest, including school district personnel, state staff or the families themselves may ask for a "requested re-interview" to determine whether the information from the re-interview is correct.

The MEA data specialist will notify the appropriate school districts in writing of the misidentified families with a request to remove migrant coding and cease services immediately. The state data collections coordinator will remove the misidentified children from the COEstar database using information from the Excel document and the regional offices will receive the corrected database through the weekly transfer of information.

Note: Requested re-interviews are not part of the quarterly quality control. All requested re-interviews for eligibility verifications will be counted separate from the quarterly random sample, and results from these interviews will be entered on the spreadsheet named "Requested Re-interviews."

### Checking Defect Rates and Identifying and Correcting ID&R Problems.

After each quarterly re-interview/round of re-interviews, the state ID&R coordinator will review the verification data collected to determine:

- 1.Reasons for ineligibility
- 2.Reasons for discrepancies between the original COE and the verification re-interview data.
- 3.Sources of incomplete/inaccurate data on the original COE

The state ID&R coordinator will summarize the issues identified quarterly, and append this summary, along with any corrective actions taken, to the QQC report.

For this reporting period, 167 re-interviews were sampled. 100 were successfully completed, and 92 (92%) were found eligible.

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.

At the beginning of each school year, and through a process managed at the MEA level by the coordinator, each child enrolled in the previous school year is re-signed. This means each family/self-eligible youth is contacted, existing data are verified, and updated information is secured. A new COE is not created, unless there has been a new qualifying move. The previous COE is recertified with any updated information or necessary corrections.

In addition to the on-going prospective re-interview process, at any time during the year and based upon the COE stored in COEstar, a determination of eligibility and accuracy of child eligibility data entry is relatively simple. The qualifying arrival date (QAD) listed on the COE is tested for the eligibility range. The residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is run. The age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he or she can be counted for funding/services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). Examples of additional checks include a comparison of like or nearly like names by looking at other demographic data (e.g., birth date, grade, gender, mother's maiden name, etc.).

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.

COEstar is a separate, but at the same time integrated component of Georgia's state wide student information collection system, with appropriate checks and balances performed in an on-going manner, annually. Each spring, the LEAs must match their migrant coding in the local student record system to the COEstar system before they are able to sign off on their data submission for the year. This helps to eliminate or correct coding and reporting errors in both systems. In addition, the COEstar Performance Reporter is run monthly to be sent to the state MEP director and regional MEA coordinators for review. This report is intended to catch obvious errors continuously throughout the program year rather than waiting until the end of the year.

As a final check for accuracy, the state MEP director is provided the data gleaned by the Performance Reporter in an Excel workbook covering the entire program year. The state MEP director reviews the data provided looking for anomalies and areas of confusion and/or contradictory data. When errors or problems are noted, immediate consultation with the state data collections coordinator, TROMIK (COEstar provider), and the regional MEA data specialists is initiated by the state director for explanation, review, and correction until the information is considered to be as accurate as possible.

eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the conclusion of each quarter's prospective re-interview work, a plan is established by the state to address, through corrective actions and improvements, any issues that led to any incorrect eligibility determinations uncovered during the re-interviews. Such plans are documented in the state's Re-Interview Quality Control Summary Report.

During the reporting period, 9/1/09 to 8/31/10, the state identified 8 (8.00%) children out of 100 whose re-interview information led to the conclusion that they were ineligible for program services and they were removed following the state's established protocol. The reasons for removing the eligibility status of these 8 children were:

1. The move was determined to be for vacation purposes.
2. The worker did not move to seek or obtain qualifying work. The worker was returning to Georgia from Mexico after picking up his son.
3. The worker was working during vacation, and the primary intention of the move was vacation.
4. The worker was a crew leader, which is non-qualifying work.
5. The move was an invalid to-join move. The worker's initial and the child's subsequent to-join move were not within the allowable 12 month period.
6. The worker came to obtain any kind of work and didn't obtain qualifying work soon after the move.
7. The intention of the move was not to seek or obtain qualifying work. It was for the worker to live with her mother.
8. The worker did not obtain qualifying work.

The following is a summary of the corrective actions taken as a result of the re-interview process during the reporting period:

All recruiters at fault were contacted individually by the state ID&R coordinator shortly after the information was confirmed and specific re-training was delivered on the problematic areas identified. Additionally, training covering the problematic points discovered during the re-interviews was integrated into the mandatory ID&R training that all staff responsible for recruiting receives during the year.

In its Re-Interview Quality Control Summary Report for 2009-2010, the state included a corrective action plan to be incorporated into its 2010-2011 ID&R training process. Also, and as required by the federal program office, 2010-2011 is designated as Georgia's year to engage a third-party entity to conduct its prospective re-interviewing to ensure the integrity of its ID&R procedures. This will occur during two re-interview periods in the months of February and September 2011. The February re-interviews will cover COEs generated from September 1, 2010 to January 31, 2011. The September re-interviews will cover COEs generated from February 1, 2011 to August 30, 2011; however, because the state has registered a 2009-2010 defect rate in excess of its defined tolerance rate of 4%, the state will not suspend its own implementation of the prospective re-interview process during the recruitment year 2010-2011, which it would have the option of doing during the designated year for the third-party involvement in the process, in order to correct recruitment errors in a timely manner.

The corrective action plan is as follows:

1. Each quarter, the three regional MEA offices will develop and deliver, under the leadership of the regional office coordinator, regional recruiters, and the state ID&R coordinator, targeted training to groups and individuals to address both the specific ID&R deficiencies that led to errors in program eligibility during the most recent round of re-interviewing in the region, as well as any errors that are being identified as new COEs are being generated and reviewed. The trainings will be mandatory for any staff with documented areas of weakness in the correct identification of eligible children and/or the proper preparation and completion of COEs.
2. The state's policy for providing specific written comments on a COE to document eligibility under "short time moves" will be strictly enforced in all regions. This policy requires that the economic necessity of any short time move, defined as less than two weeks, must be clearly explained in the comments section of the COE. Regions will be required to deny approval and return any COE without such written comments obtained from the interviewee during the eligibility interview.
3. The state will incorporate refresher training in its on-going recruiter training for all staff on how to correctly establish if a "short time move" is for vacation purposes or for economic necessity.
4. The state ID&R coordinator will have live viewing rights to the COEstar information system. The access to this information will allow the state ID&R coordinator to review current data and perform additional scheduled and unscheduled random quality control studies. The intent of the review will be to look for recruitment trends, or anomalies, as they are forming that could ultimately raise concern and impact quality control outcomes.

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 child counts being reported are accurate and are based on an eligibility determination process that is well structured and sound. The process is believed to be well structured and sound because it is fulfilling its purpose, which is to clearly bring to the state's attention, in a time frame that allows for their immediate and early corrective action, the specific deficiencies that exist in accurately recording and reporting child eligibility information.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP