

**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

LOUISIANA



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~~4~~, 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 200~~5~~6, 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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Louisiana Department of Education		
Address: 1201 N. Third Street Baton Rouge, LA 70802		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Bonnie Boulton		
Telephone: 225-342-3633		
Fax: 225-219-7370		
e-mail: Bonnie.Boulton@la.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Donna Nola-Ganey		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 10:09:34 AM
Signature _____		

**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.

In June of 2010, the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education approved adoption of the Common Core Standards in mathematics and reading/language arts. New science standards are being developed through a partnership of the National Academy of Science, the National Science Teachers Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and Achieve, Inc. The new science standards are scheduled to be completed for public review in summer, 2010. Louisiana will review and determine whether or not to adopt the new national science standards. Louisiana's Comprehensive Curriculum in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science is scheduled for revision in 2011-2012. Teachers will receive professional development on the revised curriculum in 2012-2014. Louisiana will be transitioning to the new common core standards over the next few years with full implementation occurring in 2014-2015.

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.

Louisiana is still in the planning phase for what its assessments should reflect over the next few years. LEAP and iLEAP assessments will continue to be administered to students in grades 3 through 8 until 2014-2015 when new assessments based on the common core standards will be implemented. However, some new items that reflect the new standards may be incorporated to better prepare students for the new assessments in 2014-2015. Louisiana's current End-of-Course (EOC) tests in Algebra, English II, Geometry, Biology, and English III replace the Graduation Exit Exam (GEE) for entering freshmen in 2010-2011. The timeline for item development in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts for grades 3-8 and End-of-Course (EOC) PARCC consortium tests is 2010-2012, and field testing will occur from 2012-2014. Item development for Science in grades 3-8 and EOC PARCC consortium tests will occur in 2011-2012, with field testing following in 2012-2014. Modified EOC test items will be field tested in 2010-2011 for development of EOC tests in Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Biology. Currently, there are no plans to revise the alternate achievement standards and assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

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)	80.0
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	20.0
Comments:	

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

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	356,115		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,992		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,227		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	164,197		>97
Hispanic	10,972		>97
White, non-Hispanic	172,649		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	42,133		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	6,162		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	238,362		>97
Migratory students	881		>97
Male	182,104		>97
Female	173,925		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,134	7.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,552	65.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	8,215	19.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,087	7.4
Total	41,988	
Comments: Louisiana does not test students with disabilities using an alternate assessment based on grade level achievement standards.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	355,833		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,992		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,219		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	163,998		>97
Hispanic	10,955		>97
White, non-Hispanic	172,590		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	41,973		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,146		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	238,175		>97
Migratory students	881		>97
Male	181,939		>97
Female	173,810		>97
Comments:			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,126	7.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,495	65.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	8,127	19.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,101	7.4
Total	41,849	
Comments: Louisiana does not test students with disabilities using an alternate assessment based on grade level achievement standards.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	347,370		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,911		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,213		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	158,791		>97
Hispanic	10,730		>97
White, non-Hispanic	169,650		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	36,146		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,007		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	231,057		>97
Migratory students	851		>97
Male	176,629		>97
Female	170,658		>97
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,082	8.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,358	75.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	4,238	11.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,353	3.8
Total	36,031	
Comments: Louisiana does not test students with disabilities using an alternate assessment based on grade level achievement standards.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	53,834	36,090	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	426	293	68.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	730	636	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	25,133	13,183	52.5
Hispanic	1,785	1,211	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	25,741	20,753	80.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,702	3,023	45.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,287	814	63.2
Economically disadvantaged students	38,376	22,906	59.7
Migratory students	173	109	63.0
Male	27,842	18,437	66.2
Female	25,978	17,646	67.9
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	53,834	36,428	67.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	426	306	71.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	730	621	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	25,133	14,019	55.8
Hispanic	1,785	1,173	65.7
White, non-Hispanic	25,741	20,294	78.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,705	2,849	42.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,287	766	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	38,375	23,310	60.7
Migratory students	173	105	60.7
Male	27,842	17,297	62.1
Female	25,978	19,122	73.6
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	#Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	#Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	53,410	33,895	63.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	425	294	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	726	578	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	24,921	11,485	46.1
Hispanic	1,780	1,115	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	25,540	20,412	79.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,299	2,850	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,285	704	54.8
Economically disadvantaged students	38,080	20,933	55.0
Migratory students	172	105	61.0
Male	27,554	17,495	63.5
Female	25,842	16,393	63.4
Comments:			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,616	40,608	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	513	360	70.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	752	646	85.9
Black, non-Hispanic	29,414	16,595	56.4
Hispanic	1,824	1,252	68.6
White, non-Hispanic	27,111	21,754	80.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,437	3,811	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,133	678	59.8
Economically disadvantaged students	43,196	26,558	61.5
Migratory students	144	99	68.8
Male	31,032	20,902	67.4
Female	28,576	19,703	68.9
Comments: The difference in the number of migrant students from the previous year can be attributed to the increase in the number of migrant students in Louisiana in 2008-09.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,561	40,184	67.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	514	344	66.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	750	629	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	29,365	16,362	55.7
Hispanic	1,822	1,188	65.2
White, non-Hispanic	27,108	21,660	79.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,423	3,321	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,131	582	51.5
Economically disadvantaged students	43,146	26,045	60.4
Migratory students	144	91	63.2
Male	30,986	19,536	63.0
Female	28,568	20,645	72.3
Comments: The difference in the number of migrant students from the previous year can be attributed to the increase in the number of migrant students in Louisiana in 2008-09.			

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	59,920	36,965	61.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	516	340	65.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	754	589	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	29,610	13,279	44.8
Hispanic	1,840	1,151	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	27,194	21,603	79.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,467	3,691	43.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,142	567	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	43,468	23,131	53.2
Migratory students	145	89	61.4
Male	31,212	19,604	62.8
Female	28,699	17,356	60.5
Comments: The difference in the number of migrant students from the previous year can be attributed to the increase in the number of migrant students in Louisiana in 2008-09.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,398	33,931	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	441	309	70.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	720	608	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,784	11,805	54.2
Hispanic	1,607	1,080	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	24,836	20,123	81.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,711	2,491	43.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	852	454	53.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,637	20,630	61.3
Migratory students	142	72	50.7
Male	25,415	17,676	69.5
Female	23,971	16,250	67.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,400	33,080	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	441	288	65.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	720	573	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21,789	11,997	55.1
Hispanic	1,607	1,003	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	24,833	19,215	77.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,713	2,043	35.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	852	350	41.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33,640	19,986	59.4
Migratory students	142	69	48.6
Male	25,415	15,800	62.2
Female	23,973	17,277	72.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47,905	30,276	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	434	300	69.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	716	522	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,873	9,423	45.1
Hispanic	1,589	954	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	24,283	19,072	78.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,232	1,814	42.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	839	326	38.9
Economically disadvantaged students	32,414	17,541	54.1
Migratory students	134	60	44.8
Male	24,420	16,084	65.9
Female	23,473	14,189	60.4
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,710	34,031	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	405	292	72.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	707	610	86.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,354	12,573	53.8
Hispanic	1,492	995	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	24,744	19,557	79.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,025	2,195	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	686	357	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	34,510	20,567	59.6
Migratory students	113	66	58.4
Male	25,993	17,172	66.1
Female	24,698	16,850	68.2

Comments: The difference in the number of migrant students from the previous year can be attributed to the increase in the number of migrant students in Louisiana in 2008-09.
In 2009-10, there were fewer LEP children enrolled in grade 6 than were enrolled in 2008-09.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,709	35,132	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	405	310	76.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	707	592	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,353	13,454	57.6
Hispanic	1,493	935	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	24,743	19,839	80.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,024	2,128	35.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	687	250	36.4
Economically disadvantaged students	34,511	21,393	62.0
Migratory students	112	65	58.0
Male	25,985	16,473	63.4
Female	24,705	18,653	75.5

Comments: The difference in the number of migrant students from the previous year can be attributed to the increase in the number of migrant students in Louisiana in 2008-09.
In 2009-10, there were fewer LEP children enrolled in grade 6 than were enrolled in 2008-09.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,070	31,023	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	396	289	73.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	696	570	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22,320	10,852	48.6
Hispanic	1,468	892	60.8
White, non-Hispanic	24,183	18,419	76.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,411	1,585	35.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	671	252	37.6
Economically disadvantaged students	33,136	18,177	54.9
Migratory students	111	67	60.4
Male	24,861	15,588	62.7
Female	24,192	15,430	63.8

Comments: The difference in the number of migrant students from the previous year can be attributed to the increase in the number of migrant students in Louisiana in 2008-09.
In 2009-10, there were fewer LEP children enrolled in grade 6 than were enrolled in 2008-09.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47,644	31,502	66.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	408	273	66.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	713	599	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21,402	11,118	51.9
Hispanic	1,433	938	65.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,667	18,565	78.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,099	1,770	34.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	693	325	46.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31,131	18,037	57.9
Migratory students	139	71	51.1
Male	24,457	16,036	65.6
Female	23,170	15,460	66.7
Comments:			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47,665	31,653	66.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	409	270	66.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	713	584	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	21,421	11,567	54.0
Hispanic	1,433	883	61.6
White, non-Hispanic	23,669	18,339	77.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,111	1,663	32.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	693	245	35.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31,152	18,188	58.4
Migratory students	139	72	51.8
Male	24,470	14,631	59.8
Female	23,179	17,017	73.4
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	46,033	28,078	61.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	400	267	66.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	706	559	79.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,351	8,906	43.8
Hispanic	1,414	864	61.1
White, non-Hispanic	23,141	17,472	75.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,518	1,087	30.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	677	243	35.9
Economically disadvantaged students	29,762	15,244	51.2
Migratory students	136	63	46.3
Male	23,351	14,281	61.2
Female	22,665	13,794	60.9
Comments: Data were verified and found to be accurate.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52,227	29,688	56.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	459	276	60.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	778	644	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	24,579	9,888	40.2
Hispanic	1,470	845	57.5
White, non-Hispanic	24,935	18,033	72.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,712	1,648	24.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	741	289	39.0
Economically disadvantaged students	34,267	16,112	47.0
Migratory students	97	41	42.3
Male	26,661	15,213	57.1
Female	25,564	14,474	56.6
Comments: Data were validated and found to be accurate.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52,260	31,240	59.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	459	288	62.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	778	617	79.3
Black, non-Hispanic	24,613	11,185	45.4
Hispanic	1,470	872	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	24,933	18,276	73.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,703	1,712	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	740	250	33.8
Economically disadvantaged students	34,292	17,244	50.3
Migratory students	98	44	44.9
Male	26,663	14,708	55.2
Female	25,595	16,532	64.6
Comments: Data were validated and found to be accurate.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52,764	27,370	51.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	463	264	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	784	567	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	24,957	8,037	32.2
Hispanic	1,488	749	50.3
White, non-Hispanic	25,064	17,752	70.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,784	1,732	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	751	186	24.8
Economically disadvantaged students	34,706	14,072	40.5
Migratory students	98	40	40.8
Male	26,955	14,334	53.2
Female	25,804	13,034	50.5
Comments: Data were validated and found to be accurate.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,030	4,722	11.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	337	31	9.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	755	237	31.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,223	643	3.5
Hispanic	1,202	124	10.3
White, non-Hispanic	21,508	3,687	17.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,302	34	1.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	490	19	3.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,746	1,208	5.3
Migratory students	70	N<10	
Male	20,329	2,651	13.0
Female	21,694	2,071	9.5
Comments: Data were validated and found to be accurate.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,782	26,856	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	336	226	67.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	750	596	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	18,044	9,446	52.3
Hispanic	1,191	678	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	21,456	15,910	74.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,170	932	29.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	483	103	21.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,592	12,458	55.1
Migratory students	70	33	47.1
Male	20,209	11,877	58.8
Female	21,567	14,978	69.4
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,584	22,830	60.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	186	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	761	544	71.5
Black, non-Hispanic	15,418	6,523	42.3
Hispanic	994	531	53.4
White, non-Hispanic	20,134	15,045	74.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,320	860	37.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	365	76	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	18,948	9,381	49.5
Migratory students	51	17	33.3
Male	17,872	11,823	66.2
Female	19,705	11,005	55.8
Comments: The difference in the number of migrant students from the previous year can be attributed to the increase in the number of migrant students in Louisiana in 2008-09. In 2009-10, there were fewer LEP children enrolled in grade 6 than were enrolled in 2008-09.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,236	1,089	88.1
Districts	77	21	27.3
Comments: The increase in the number of districts from the previous year is attributed to the increase in the number of charter schools in the state.			

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	995	866	87.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	831	720	86.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	164	146	89.0
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
129	20	15.5
Comments: The number of districts that receive Title I funds is greater than the number of districts in accountability because charter schools receive individual allotments for Title I and IDEA. However, for the purposes of accountability, multiple charter schools that are governed by one chartering organization are considered as one district.		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	16
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	8
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	6
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	18
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	2
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	1
Other major restructuring of the school governance	15
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Fifteen schools entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) and its State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE). These MOUs allow for constant communication and collaboration between the local school board, the LDE, and BESE around the decisions made instructional practices, hiring policies, budgetary procedures and regular operations leading to the achievement of the lowest performing schools.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

!Louisiana does not have any districts in improvement at this time.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	12/01/10
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	22,547	23,136
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	8,450	9,305
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	37.5	40.2
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	22,486	23,135
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	9,744	9,356
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	43.3	40.4
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	56
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	24

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

Comments:

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
<p>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
5	Restructured the master schedule to incorporate intervention classes in math and ELA in all grade levels; after school tutoring; employ Instructional Coaches to assist teachers with instructional strategies and assessments	17	5	5	A	Modified schedules, extended learning opportunities, created longitudinal data systems
5					B	Grade Level Expectation (GLE) Benchmark Tests in math and ELA were higher in grades 6 and 8 at one school
2					B	
2					D	
1						
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C =Improved parental involvement

D =Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The School Improvement staff of the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) have made revisions to the school improvement plan and training process. The LDE recently added Innovative Configuration Charts for each of the highlighted Best Practices/Strategies we share with districts and schools. These ICs were part of the new training schedule that took place in Spring and Summer of 2010. The LDE provided regular training opportunities for all LEAs. Each region participates in intensive training that helps school support teams monitor and evaluate data derived from a comprehensive needs assessment and analysis system; assists schools in creating and evaluating effective school improvement planning process; and guides the LEAs with monitoring the implementation of the strategies outlined in the school's school improvement plan.

The State also provided professional development to administrators, school support team members, coaches, and teachers in the current research on the five essentials components of reading and assessment of these areas.

The State provided regular, component-specific professional development activities for participating in Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) schools. The ultimate goal of TAP is to raise student achievement. The method for getting there is to create incentives and support structures that will maximize teacher effectiveness. To measure whether TAP's objectives are met, we use a variety of methods to evaluate TAP's impact on student achievement, teacher effectiveness, teacher attitudes, and recruitment and retention. The LDE offers a Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). The ultimate goal of the TAP is to strengthen teacher instructional capacity and increase student achievement. TAP is unique in that it is comprehensive in nature combining 4 key elements (multiple career paths, ongoing job-embedded professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance based compensation). The following services, technical assistance, and strategies were provided to all TAP schools:

1. TAP Core Training (five-day) training that provides key TAP implementation strategies as it relates to the TAP Leadership Team, the TAP Cluster Meetings, and the TAP Evaluation Process
2. TAP Evaluator Certification Training (two-day) training that trains and certifies all of the TAP School Leadership Team members (principals, asst principals, master teachers, mentor teachers) as TAP evaluators
3. Quarterly Master Teacher Support and Networking Meetings for the master teachers at TAP schools - professional development provided by State Executive Master Teachers (topics include such things as effective clusters, data analysis, field testing instructional strategies, identifying student need)
4. Quarterly Principal Support and Networking Meetings for the principals at TAP schools - professional development provided by State Executive Master Teachers
5. A State Executive Master Teacher is assigned to each TAP school. The Executive Master Teacher provides onsite support (consultation, observation, coaching) to the master and mentor teachers of TAP schools. Support is provided approximately 2-4 times per month at the school.

The College and Career Readiness staff of LDE focuses on major activities regarding the Professional School Counseling Initiative and the 9th Grade Initiative.

- Regional "Tools for Schools" meetings focusing on research-based best practices for increasing the graduation rate (Fall 2009)
- Statewide Professional School Counselors' Conference (December 2009)
- Regional follow-up counselor meetings focusing on new comprehensive, data-driven state counseling model (Spring 2010)
- Regional technical support meetings for 9th Grade Initiative Grant Schools involving 35 schools in 28 LEAs (Quarterly 2009-10)
- Technical assistance visits to 9th Grade Initiative Grant Schools focusing on strategies for successful transitions to high school (2009-10)
- Regional High School Redesign Mini Summits to share best practices for improving outcomes for 8th-12th grade students (May-June 2010)

Specific strategies shared as best practices included:

- Personalization Strategies
- 9th Grade Academy
- Teacher Teaming (with common, structured planning time)
- Freshman Transition Skills Course
- Freshman Orientation Activities
- Parental Involvement
- Summer Bridge Programs
- Credit/Grade/Homework Recovery Programs
- Mentoring Programs
- Advisory Programs
- Literacy Skills
- Early Dropout Detection and Prevention
- Academic Catch-up
- Educational and Career Planning
- 10th Grade Academies
- Reaching out to Middle Schools
- Comprehensive School Counseling Programs

Ongoing technical assistance is provided to districts by the state with follow-up visits based on targeted assistance.

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.

In accordance with our 1003(g) application agreements with LEAs and schools, Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) will strive to build capacity in current school improvement structures, to expand resources, and to support additional schools and districts in need. LDE will report the number of schools that receive technical assistance and Title I School Improvement Grant funds that make AYP and/or exit improvement status. Each school submitted quarterly reports on the use of 1003(g) and assessed the active performance of teachers in accordance with the school's identified strategies from the school improvement plan. The LDE conducted on-site visits and used periodic surveys to gather information regarding the implementation of the school improvement activities. The Regional Education Service Center staff of the LDE provided technical support in the areas of Literacy and Numeracy and High School Redesign. If the school does not make AYP, more aggressive and intensive efforts from the Department will be focused on the school in an effort to continue to provide assistance.

DIBELS Benchmark and Progress Monitoring were used to evaluate students reading levels throughout the state. The LDE also contracts with an external evaluator, the Cecil Picard Center at the University of LA at Lafayette. Districts are provided technical assistance from LDE staff such as Regional Literacy Coordinators and Educational Program Consultants. Technical assistance consist of but is not limited to the following, data examination, small group instruction, core program support, coach support, as well as numerous professional development in areas such as classroom management, DIBELS testing, and LETRS Foundations.

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.

State Literacy funds were used to provide professional development for administrators, school support staff, coaches, and teachers in areas such as literacy, numeracy, data driven instruction, classroom management, small group instruction and differentiated instruction. These funds were also used to provide technical assistance to schools by regional literacy coordinators as well as state staff members. In order to implement the state's literacy plan the SEA ensures that the School Improvement Plan has literacy as its primary focus, adhere to daily instruction of the scientifically based reading research (SBRR) essential components (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary/oral language, fluency, comprehension, and writing) in all classes for a connected school-wide literacy effort (as appropriate for each grade level), implement systematic, and explicit reading instruction. Implement the three-tiered Response to Intervention (RTI) model of service delivery, providing extended time for literacy instruction for Tier II (up to 6 students) and Tier III (up to 4 students) for grades K-4 to include an additional 30-60 minutes based upon student needs according to data analysis and the level of intervention intensity, each day that school is in session. Progress monitoring at least monthly is strongly recommended for students who have recently achieved benchmark after receiving intervention, those who scored just above the benchmark DIBELS goal, and others for whom teachers have concerns based on classroom performance.

Districts re-allocate existing district, state and federal dollars: Title I (Part A, Section 1114 School-Wide Program), (Part A Set Aside), (Financial Incentives & Rewards); Title II (Part A Teacher Quality State Grant); Title V (Innovative Program); IDEA Part B (Early Intervening Services); K-3 Reading & Math Initiative (Allowable Expenses); Education Excellence Fund (EEF); business partnerships, donations, line item appropriations. In 2009-2010, participating districts will receive an allocation of state 8(g) money for TAP, Literacy, and Numeracy.

In Spring 2010, the School Improvement section collaborated with representatives from all areas of the LDE to provide statewide technical assistance in modeling and integrating federal funds. The LDE has published a book detailing Use of Funds, as well the Integration of Education Funds, entitled Tools for Integrating Education Funds.

The purpose of this fiscal model is to assist local education agency (LEA) staff with:

1. Identifying Promising Initiatives that serve as best practices for meeting educational priority goals identified by the State of Louisiana; and
2. Assessing how federal, state and local funding sources can be used together to implement promising initiatives.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	27,156
Applied to transfer	1,420
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	927
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,426,075

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	3

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	30,702
Applied for supplemental educational services	9,621
Received supplemental educational services	6,356
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 6,908,930
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	184,198	159,368	86.5	24,830	13.5
All elementary classes	131,442	114,845	87.4	16,597	12.6
All secondary classes	52,756	44,523	84.4	8,233	15.6

Louisiana now collects data at the classroom, not simply the building, level. We believe this now allows better reporting particularly for grades 6, 7, and 8, regardless of the grades taught in a particular building. (K-12; K-8; 6-9; etc.) Per item "D" in the FAQ for section 1.5.1, Louisiana is defining "elementary" as grades K-8, which may explain the change in percentage from last year for elementary and secondary classes. This definition is also consistent with how the state reports EDEN data. The data for section 1.5.1 comes directly from Louisiana's EDEN submission.

Concerning the discrepancies in district-reported and state-reported course counts, we believe some districts may not be weighting self-contained classes in the same way the state does.

We believe the overall HQ percentages in December 2010 are comparable to those reported in December 2009, and that the primary shift has been a matter of capturing more middle school grades and counting them as elementary rather than secondary.

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.

Louisiana uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, one for each subject.

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	36.3
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	17.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	46.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	45.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	42.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	3,279	3,107	94.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	57,470	48,062	83.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	3,676	3,535	96.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	8,264	6,535	79.1
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 break 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	58.9	92.3
Poverty metric used	free and reduced lunch were used to measure poverty.	
Secondary schools	84.5	52.2
Poverty metric used	free and reduced lunch were used to measure poverty.	

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 LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.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
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Several LEAs use push-in where students are served in the mainstream classroom with ESL teacher or paraprofessional providing clarification and translation as needed.

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	13,093
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	12,513
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	9,055
Vietnamese	1,585
Arabic	742
Chinese	383
French	244

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	12,028
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	88
Total	12,116
Comments: The LDOE will be checking its total LEP population figures and will respond to this ELPA assessment participation question during the CSPR Part 1 verification period.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	505
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	4.2
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	11,513
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	79
Total	11,592
Comments: The LDOE will be checking its total LEP population figures and will respond to this ELPA assessment participation question during the CSPR Part 1 verification period.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	3,315

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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	4,038	49.3	3,730	45.00
Attained proficiency	1,439	12.5	1,048	9.10
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
NA
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
2,274	5,118	7,392
Comments:		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,486	2,162	87.0	324
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,485	2,197	88.4	288
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,420	1,951	80.6	469
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	33
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	17
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	25
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	24
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	31
# - 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	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Separate consortia members were counted in the total number of subgrantees and in AMAOs 1, 2, and 3 determinations.

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 <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u> </u> No
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u> </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
3,200	946	15

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 'Language 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.	241
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	291

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	29	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	27	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	23	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	21	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	19	
Other (Explain in comment box)	7	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	30	5,592
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	23	1,615
PD provided to principals	26	748
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	27	811
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	22	1,178
PD provided to community based organization personnel	8	257
Total	136	10,201

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Several LEAs offered community-based/family-oriented professional development, job-embedded subject matter professional development at school sites, and professional development on using technology in ESL programs.
--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	07/01/09	0
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>In the 2010-2011 funding cycle, the state implemented procedures to allow all recipients that submit application in the electronic grants management system to draw down funds once a substantially approved application was submitted or July 1, whichever was later. This process allowed the LEAs to be able to draw funds during the process of the SEA making final approval of their application. This ensured the LEA's ability to maintain their Title III program without a period of inactivity due to funding constraints.</p>
--

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: There were no persistently dangerous schools in Louisiana during the 2009-10 school year.	

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	67.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	59.1
Hispanic	63.0
White, non-Hispanic	74.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34.3
Limited English proficient	47.4
Economically disadvantaged	60.3
Migratory students	44.7
Male	61.5
Female	73.2
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	6.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	8.5
Hispanic	7.1
White, non-Hispanic	4.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11.2
Limited English proficient	9.1
Economically disadvantaged	7.0
Migratory students	6.0
Male	7.2
Female	5.0
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	89	89
LEAs with subgrants	41	41
Total	130	130
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	209	1,240
K	371	2,109
1	392	2,099
2	369	1,995
3	342	1,994
4	346	2,210
5	279	1,615
6	277	1,554
7	268	1,341
8	225	1,574
9	181	1,371
10	145	966
11	86	822
12	93	736
Ungraded	N<10	12
Total		21,638
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	189	1,433
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,092	17,525
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	197	2,189
Hotels/Motels	107	491
Total	3,585	21,638
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,501
K	2,244
1	2,111
2	1,977
3	2,019
4	2,212
5	1,688
6	1,624
7	1,390
8	1,615
9	1,420
10	1,011
11	867
12	735
Ungraded	291
Total	22,705
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,013
Migratory children/youth	96
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,581
Limited English proficient students	463
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	30
Expedited evaluations	13
Staff professional development and awareness	25
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	19
Transportation	18
Early childhood programs	22
Assistance with participation in school programs	28
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	22
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	24
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	23
Coordination between schools and agencies	26
Counseling	19
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	18
Clothing to meet a school requirement	41
School supplies	39
Referral to other programs and services	27
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	20
Other (optional – in comment box below)	13
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The other services reported by LEAs include school fees, bus tokens for alternative transportation for students to remain in school of origin, and other educational enrichment activities.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	6
School Selection	4
Transportation	6
School records	6
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	3
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	1,487	850
4	1,638	944
5	1,236	695
6	1,157	650
7	988	530
8	1,072	471
High School	679	352
Comments:		

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	1,487	842
4	1,640	965
5	1,236	694
6	1,159	654
7	987	531
8	1,076	433
High School	688	37
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	344
K	256
1	246
2	258
3	249
4	275
5	232
6	229
7	217
8	223
9	176
10	134
11	104
12	120
Ungraded	33
Out-of-school	153
Total	3,249

Comments:

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2008-2009 count was 3,382 and the 2009-2010 count is 3249. The difference of 133 is not greater than 10%.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	43
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2008-2009 Category 2 Child Count was 143 migrant children compared to the 43 in the 2009-2010 Category 2 Child Count. Louisiana's migrant education programs historically have not offered programs during intercession periods, so the decrease in the Category 2 child count relates to changes in enrollment of migrant students in MEP-funded summer projects.

Two LOAs that historically conduct MEP-funded summer projects report that a number of migrant children elected to participate in other summer programs funded through Title I or Title III. In addition, since both of these LOAs are in areas most impacted by the Deep Water Horizon oil spill, some migrant children in these areas elected to participate in summer programs funded by British Petroleum.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Migrant Education Records in Louisiana (MERIL2) or MIS 2000 was used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts. MERIL2 is the system used to calculate the 2008-2009 child count.

MERIL2 (Migrant Education Records in Louisiana) is the name of the database where migrant records are stored. MIS2000 is the software used to run the database.

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.

In Louisiana, when children are first recruited, data specialists in each of the local MEP LOAs enter data from each child's Certificate Of Eligibility (COE) into the MERIL2 system. This information includes not only parent/guardian information and qualifying work activities, but also key dates, such as each child's birth date, the qualifying arrival date (also known as the last qualifying move date) and the residency date. In addition, if the child is enrolled in school, the data specialist enters the actual school enrollment date. All of these dates are used in the calculation process. In addition to COE data, school histories are maintained on all migrant children entered. This is done continuously throughout the year.

School enrollments are entered yearly in MERIL2 after the advocates have verified each child's presence in school, his/her school enrollment date and his/her grade level. This is referred to as "mass enrollment" and is done on or after September 1 each year. To do this, a list of the children who were in each service area the previous year is generated from MERIL2 and provided to all advocates. The advocates check on each child on the list, either through school or home visits, to verify data. Once completed, this list is used to record either the school enrollment (including grade level and any school changes), or to record that the children have moved or were unable to be located.

Louisiana uses this process instead of securing new COEs (unless there has been a new qualifying move) or updating COEs on each family because it accomplishes the requirement to verify and document the presence of each child with a minimized paperwork burden. In addition to the mass enrollment process at the beginning of the school year, a mass withdrawal process is done much the same way at the end of the school year. When the advocates have collected all the data, they sign, date and return the COEs to the data specialists, who enter and file the signed COEs for documentation of each student's residence.

The data specialist in each region generates a list of children from MERIL (run by MIS2000 software) for each advocate. The list contains all demographic information about each child assigned to the advocate. The advocate then contacts each family on the list either through home, school, or workplace visits or via phone to verify the data on the original COE. During this "mass enrollment" time, the advocate also determines if the family has left the area or has made a new migrant move during the previous year. If the family has left the area, the advocate will try to locate where the family has moved by using strategies such as reviewing school records and performing a MSIX search. The outcome of this investigation is recorded on the family list (moved, unable to locate). The data specialist then performs the necessary steps such as transferring records and/or termination of the children. If the advocate determines that the family has made a new migrant move during the previous year, he/she completes a new COE with the most up-to-date information.

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.

All of the MEP student data is run entirely from the MERIL2 data system. The data are uploaded to the state server where the state staff reviews all COEs and other migrant data as appropriate. If corrections are to be made to any of the migrant student data, data specialists are notified by state staff, and corrections are duly made and uploaded on a weekly basis.

MERIL2 (Migrant Education Records in Louisiana) is the name of the database where migrant records are stored. MIS2000 is the software used to run the database.

Louisiana adopted the national COE in September 2009. There was correspondence between Pat Doucet, Louisiana's Title I, Part C Coordinator at that time, and Lisa Gillette regarding inclusion of all required elements on Louisiana's COE.

The advocates maintain contact with their families throughout the year. Each child's needs assessment is updated three times per year - at the beginning of the school year, in January, and at the end of the year. The data specialist makes any changes recorded on the updated needs assessment in MERIL2.

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.

N/A

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.

In calculating the count of eligible students for the reporting period, only students who meet the program eligibility guidelines are counted, using several mathematical checks that are utilized to ensure that children are within the eligible age range and had a documented residency during the period. MERIL2 calculates fields of LQM3 (last qualifying move date plus three years), twenty-second birth date (birth date plus twenty-two years), and third birth date (birth date plus three years).

The counting program selects only children who resided in the state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1/09-8/31/10), whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 9/1/09 whose third birth date is less than or equal to 8/31/10, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date. The residency determination is made by selecting only children whose funding date (school enrollment date or generated date of residency date for students not in school) is between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10, residency date is between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10, withdrawal date is between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10, or termination date is between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10.

The summer report selects children who received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term and whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 5/25/10, whose twenty-second birth date is greater than or equal to 5/26/10, whose third birth date is less than or equal to 07/31/10, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date or termination is null, whose third birth date is less than or equal to the withdrawal date or the withdrawal date is null, whose enrollment date was between 5/26/10 and 07/31/10, and whose enrollment type was S (summer) or a Supplemental program date between 05/25/10 - 07/31/10. If the enrollment was entered in error, it is removed.

MERIL2 assures that students are counted only once per child count category by assigning each child a student sequence number. If a child has multiple school history lines that fit the funding criteria, MERIL2 only counts the student sequence number once.

All children assigned to an advocate are on the mass enrollment list. Since the list is run after September 1, Category 2 children (have an enrollment type of "S" in MERIL2), would be included on the list.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Louisiana's Quality Control process begins with a well-trained recruiting staff. Recruiter training is conducted at least annually by the SEA and/or regional LOAs, and training covers topics such as eligibility requirements, eligibility definition, principal means of livelihood, and temporary versus seasonal employment. Student eligibility is based on personal interviews with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult.

A Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for each qualifying family, recording the name, birth date, and other significant data for each child. The COE serves a double purpose: not only does it document the eligibility for each child determined to qualify for the MEP in Louisiana, but it also provides the source for the data to be entered into the MERIL2 database system. The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the COEs are verified through a quality control process that has been in place since 1989.

After the COE is completed by the recruiter and entered into MERIL2, a copy is given to the local MEP LOA coordinator for certification that, based upon the information on the COE, the child (ren) listed on the COE are eligible. If certified by the coordinator, the COE is uploaded to the state server for final approval by LDE MEP staff. This quality control process for checking each Certificate of Eligibility (COE) takes place within a period of 48 hours or as soon as possible thereafter. If a COE is determined ineligible, the child's preliminary records are deleted from the system.

Throughout the year, checks are taken by staff to ensure that no duplications exist with student records. On the LOA level, the data specialist begins the process of entering COEs by conducting a search of the database by using the "Potential Duplicate" function in MERIL2. When similar names are found, the data specialist reviews birth dates, parents' names and other data to determine whether the name is new, or a duplicate. If the data specialist determines that the name matches an existing student, the record is downloaded into the regional database and updated with the new information from the COE, such as a more recent qualifying move or a residency in a new school district. If there is no match for the name or names on the COE, the data specialist creates a new record. At the end of each working day, all information is uploaded to the state database so that it exists in both sites. If duplicates are identified, state staff will merge the two records into one and then contact the regional office to download the merged record.

The following cross-checks are programmed into the reports used to generate child counts to ensure no duplicates are included in child count numbers:

- 1) Students with matching social security numbers;
- 2) Students with matching date of birth, and last names (excluding students marked as multiple births);
- 3) Students with the same first name and date of birth -but totally different last names (possibly adopted or married);
- 4) Students with same last names, and similar date of birth.

All LOAs were instructed to verify that summer enrollments were based on programs and services provided during the actual period of summer vacation in the relevant school district. (School schedules vary from district to district.) The LOAs are also instructed to keep documentation of summer services.

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.

In addition to verifying the residency of each child through the mass-enrollment procedure, the prospective re-interview process is conducted throughout the year within each of the eight MEP local operating agencies. Each region generates a list of migrant families to be re-interviewed by using a MERIL2/2000 feature designed to produce a random sample for this purpose called a snap report. The snap reports are organized according to school district name in order to facilitate location of the families. A trained recruiter other than the one who completed the original COE performs the re-interview.

The LOA re-interviewer attempts to make a home visit or calls the family and uses the ConQIR Consortium-developed re-interview questions. If the family cannot be located the first time, no more than two further attempts are made to re-interview the family.

During the re-interview, all data regarding eligibility and student information is verified. All discrepancies are noted for review and correction and a decision is made on the validity of the original eligibility determination by the re-interviewer. When the random list is completed or no more families can be located, the re-interviewer reports the results of the re-interviews to the regional director who reviews the report and determines, with assistance of the SEA, what actions need to be taken if errors or ineligible children are found. In 2009-2010, no ineligible children were reported as a result of the re-interviews.

For FY2010-2011, the LDE has contracted with ESCORT to conduct its independent re-interview procedure.

Each LOA maintains a services log for each eligible child. The log records the actual service provided, the start and end date of the

service, whether or not the service was funded with MEP funds, and the person/agency that provided the service. All of this data is input into MERIL2. A copy of the services log is kept in the child's folder and is available for review and verification by the State.

249 COES were randomly chosen to be re-interviewed; 149 were actually contacted and interviewed; N/A; Two were determined ineligible and removed from MERIL2.

Ratio: 147/149

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The first step in checking child count data is the data specialist's review of all of the data recorded on the COE. This ensures that the COE is complete. Then, as a second step, after the data specialist enters the data from the COE into MERIL2, a copy of the entered data is printed from MERIL2 and the entered data is checked against the original COE to verify accuracy. Finally, once the COE is sent to the LDE for approval, the accuracy of all of the data from the COE is again reviewed for accuracy. If changes are made, the LDE staff alerts the local data specialist so changes can be made to the local database. Throughout the year, the advocate advises the data specialist of any changes that need to be made to keep the record up-to-date.

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.

Before the submission of the Category 1 and Category 2 child count data for annual reporting, state staff creates a "Snapshot" of the MERIL2 database that "freezes" MERIL2, which helps ensure the integrity of the data used for reporting. Once reports are run from the snapshot, state staff compares the total counts to the list of students for each child count to promote error-free reporting. Electronic versions of the list of students included in the counts are saved on the state server.

The Category 1 and Category 2 child counts are reviewed by the MEP State Director to provide an additional review of the data that will be submitted.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2009-2010 prospective re-interview results did not trigger any corrective actions or improvements. The state provides annual recruiter/advocate training with additional updates on the regulations in the area of identification and recruitment.

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 SEA has no concerns at this time about the accuracy of the 2009-2010 child counts or underlying eligibility determinations. All information has been validated by regional and state personnel using MIS2000/MERIL2 database, COEs, parent/guardian interviews, local re-interviews, school records, and other relative documentation.