

**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

MAINE



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: Maine		
Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0023		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Wanda Monthey		
Telephone: 207-624-6831		
Fax: 207-624-6821		
e-mail: wanda.monthey@maine.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Wanda Monthey		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 4:57:57 PM
Signature _____		

This section of the 2009-10 CSPR was certified by Wanda Monthey wanda.monthey@maine.gov624-6831

**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.

While no changes in the state's academic content standards are imminent, Maine does have a long-term plan of adopting and implementing the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics in the coming years. Maine's Commissioner of Education has provisionally adopted the CCSS at this time and the full state legislature is expected to formally vote on the adoption and implementation of the CCSS early in the next session (Jan. 2011). Additionally, Maine is a governing state member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) that has been awarded funding to design and create an operational assessment of the CCSS for the 2014-15 school year. No other changes to the state's academic content standards are expected during this timeframe.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The only changes in Maine's assessment system are confined to the state's alternate assessment program -the Personalized Alternate Assessment Program (PAAP). All aspects of the recently restructured PAAP are currently in the Peer Review process, including: alignment of tasks to the NECAP academic standards, instituting a required blueprint of task selection, achievement level standard setting and improved technical guidance and parent/guardian reporting.

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

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	99,007		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	832	807	97.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,724		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	2,903		>97
Hispanic	1,143		>97
White, non-Hispanic	92,405		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,530	15,979	96.7
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	2,395		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	41,443		>97
Migratory students	34		>97
Male	50,980		>97
Female	48,027		>97

Comments: The special ed data anomalies are being investigated by our data team.

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	3,220	20.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,650	73.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,080	6.8
Total	15,950	

Comments: The special ed data anomalies are being investigated by our data team. The number under

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	99,026		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	833		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,724		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	2,903		>97
Hispanic	1,142		>97
White, non-Hispanic	92,424		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,542	16,007	96.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,394	2,313	96.6
Economically disadvantaged students	41,453		>97
Migratory students	34		>97
Male	50,990		>97
Female	48,036		>97
Comments: The special ed data anomalies are being investigated by our data team.			

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	3,201	20.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,647	72.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,138	7.1
Total	15,986	
Comments: The special ed data anomalies are being investigated by our data team.		

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	43,054		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	355		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	733		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	1,221		>97
Hispanic	484		>97
White, non-Hispanic	40,261		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,884	6,642	96.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	925	896	96.9
Economically disadvantaged students	17,106		>97
Migratory students	16	15	93.8
Male	22,107		>97
Female	20,947		>97
Comments: There is only one student that did not test.			

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	1,778	26.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,249	63.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	619	9.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	6,646	
Comments: The special ed data anomalies are being investigated by our data team.		

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	13,429	8,343	62.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	128	69	53.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	292	190	65.1
Black, non-Hispanic	409	128	31.3
Hispanic	167	87	52.1
White, non-Hispanic	12,433	7,869	63.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,066	686	33.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	430	140	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	6,056	3,003	49.6
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	<3
Male	6,928	4,367	63.0
Female	6,501	3,976	61.2
Comments: N is very small number			

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	13,418	9,734	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	128	84	65.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	282	199	70.6
Black, non-Hispanic	401	183	45.6
Hispanic	166	97	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	12,441	9,171	73.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,066	785	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	410	172	42.0
Economically disadvantaged students	6,047	3,745	61.9
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	40.0
Male	6,922	4,792	69.2
Female	6,496	4,942	76.1
Comments: N is small number			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

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	13,659	8,504	62.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	49	48.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	220	143	65.0
Black, non-Hispanic	424	154	36.3
Hispanic	154	70	45.5
White, non-Hispanic	12,760	8,088	63.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,474	897	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	383	130	33.9
Economically disadvantaged students	6,142	3,053	49.7
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	66.7
Male	7,025	4,413	62.8
Female	6,634	4,091	61.7
Comments:			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	13,650	9,163	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	65	64.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	219	155	70.8
Black, non-Hispanic	414	180	43.5
Hispanic	150	89	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	12,766	8,674	67.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,475	839	33.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	366	152	41.5
Economically disadvantaged students	6,130	3,446	56.2
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	66.7
Male	7,026	4,437	63.2
Female	6,624	4,726	71.3
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Maine does not test science in grade 4			

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	13,811	8,795	63.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	125	68	54.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	241	162	67.2
Black, non-Hispanic	429	160	37.3
Hispanic	152	83	54.6
White, non-Hispanic	12,864	8,322	64.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,375	813	34.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	349	112	32.1
Economically disadvantaged students	6,170	3,164	51.3
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	75.0
Male	7,159	4,569	63.8
Female	6,652	4,226	63.5
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	13,794	9,983	72.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	125	78	62.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	237	172	72.6
Black, non-Hispanic	411	233	56.7
Hispanic	151	105	69.5
White, non-Hispanic	12,870	9,395	73.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,380	865	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	323	145	44.9
Economically disadvantaged students	6,159	3,796	61.6
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	50.0
Male	7,155	4,792	67.0
Female	6,639	5,191	78.2
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	13,812	8,816	63.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	128	66	51.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	240	141	58.8
Black, non-Hispanic	425	142	33.4
Hispanic	158	82	51.9
White, non-Hispanic	12,861	8,385	65.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,370	958	40.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	356	82	23.0
Economically disadvantaged students	6,295	3,292	52.3
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	75.0
Male	7,156	4,756	66.5
Female	6,656	4,060	61.0
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	14,109	8,880	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	52	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	264	179	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	404	161	39.9
Hispanic	175	85	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	13,162	8,403	63.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,381	687	28.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	342	106	31.0
Economically disadvantaged students	6,085	2,978	48.9
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	28.6
Male	7,168	4,548	63.4
Female	6,941	4,332	62.4
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,106	9,628	68.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	58	55.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	260	181	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	393	185	47.1
Hispanic	174	108	62.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,175	9,096	69.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,391	690	28.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	326	123	37.7
Economically disadvantaged students	6,089	3,417	56.1
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	28.6
Male	7,169	4,496	62.7
Female	6,937	5,132	74.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No science testing in Grade 6			

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	14,217	8,483	59.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	139	64	46.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	209	151	72.2
Black, non-Hispanic	418	148	35.4
Hispanic	170	72	42.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,281	8,048	60.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,378	598	25.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	313	96	30.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,949	2,759	46.4
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	66.7
Male	7,395	4,487	60.7
Female	6,822	3,996	58.6
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	14,205	9,760	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	139	78	56.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	205	158	77.1
Black, non-Hispanic	408	215	52.7
Hispanic	167	100	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	13,286	9,209	69.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,379	672	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	294	112	38.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5,937	3,387	57.0
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	66.7
Male	7,388	4,579	62.0
Female	6,817	5,181	76.0
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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No science testing in grade 7			

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	14,315	8,530	59.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	116	53	45.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	262	179	68.3
Black, non-Hispanic	430	148	34.4
Hispanic	150	72	48.0
White, non-Hispanic	13,357	8,078	60.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,318	482	20.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	317	75	23.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,712	2,586	45.3
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	40.0
Male	7,257	4,305	59.3
Female	7,058	4,225	59.9
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,305	9,792	68.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	118	59	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	257	196	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	421	209	49.6
Hispanic	148	84	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	13,361	9,244	69.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,323	601	25.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	298	112	37.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,707	3,184	55.8
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	40.0
Male	7,249	4,456	61.5
Female	7,056	5,336	75.6
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,230	10,213	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	118	66	55.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	262	189	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	427	197	46.1
Hispanic	156	95	60.9
White, non-Hispanic	13,267	9,666	72.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,268	935	41.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	313	89	28.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5,744	3,453	60.1
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	40.0
Male	7,198	5,326	74.0
Female	7,032	4,887	69.5
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,172	6,386	45.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	94	26	27.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	219	112	51.1
Black, non-Hispanic	334	73	21.9
Hispanic	155	63	40.6
White, non-Hispanic	13,370	6,112	45.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,959	285	14.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	218	27	12.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,584	1,275	27.8
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	33.3
Male	7,235	3,378	46.7
Female	6,937	3,008	43.4
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,189	6,741	47.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	97	26	26.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	219	91	41.6
Black, non-Hispanic	334	93	27.8
Hispanic	155	66	42.6
White, non-Hispanic	13,384	6,465	48.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,973	320	16.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	221	N<20	
Economically disadvantaged students	4,596	1,433	31.2
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	33.3
Male	7,246	3,320	45.8
Female	6,943	3,421	49.3
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	14,272	5,818	40.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	99	22	22.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	216	76	35.2
Black, non-Hispanic	338	65	19.2
Hispanic	156	56	35.9
White, non-Hispanic	13,463	5,599	41.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,005	275	13.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	227	N<20	
Economically disadvantaged students	4,663	1,219	26.1
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	16.7
Male	7,327	3,363	45.9
Female	6,945	2,455	35.3
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL DISTRICT AND 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	616	287	46.6
Districts	166	122	73.5
Comments: Maine is in the process of district reorganization and as a result, the number of school districts has decreased.			

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	435	234	53.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	42	20	47.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	393	214	54.5
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
166	122	73.5
Comments:		

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	2
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments: Numbers provided include schools in SIY2 and SIY3	

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)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
Comments: No 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.

Schools entering year two (restructuring), in addition to enlisting the support of an outside expert to facilitate the change process, also implemented a "teaming" approach that created cross discipline teams. The intent was to:

- 1) Gain greater understanding of curricular intersections across disciplines,
- 2) Provide avenues for directed discussions related to student needs, and
- 3) Develop professional learning communities aimed at expanding instructional strategies, standards and expectations for learning.

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.

In 2009-2010, there were two LEAs identified for district improvement. SEA Title I staff provide ongoing technical assistance for districts identified. This support includes onsite meetings and/or conference calls as needed. Support activities include reviewing data to identify root causes for achievement challenges. Technical assistance also includes a review of activities planned for professional development and parental involvement in all schools. Improvement efforts undertaken at any Title I schools in improvement status are also reviewed to ensure consistency in programming.

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: During 2009-10, Maine had only 1 district identified for DIY2.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	10	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	11/1/10
---	---------

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	9,250	
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	4,786	
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	51.7	
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	9,220	
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	5,550	
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	60.2	
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	15
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	6

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: This data needs to be updated. Numbers do not reflect schools currently in improvement status that actually made AYP in 2009-10. We will correct in February.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used	Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies) (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	NA	50	13	28	A	NA
2	NA	52	13	28	A	NA
3	NA	40	8	18	A	NA
4	NA	51	13	28	B	NA
5	SIOP	2	1	1	A	NA
5	PAAP	1	0	0	A	NA
5	Student Lead Conferences	5	1	3	C	NA
5	Staff/School Wide Surveys	4	2	3	B	NA
Comments: Additional: Strategy 6/Strategies 1-5/30/7/14/ABC/NA Strategy 6/Strategies 1-4/10/3/6/AB/NA						

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 MDOE CIPS team meets on a weekly basis to discuss school plans, receive professional development, and share effective improvement strategies. This information is then shared directly with school level improvement teams.

When appropriate and to limit the interruptions created by travel, webinars are used to disseminate information common for multiple teams (i.e required communications, CIPS process, funding questions). The sessions are all posted on the MDOE/NCLB website, providing opportunities for school access to the information.

A CIPS principals network was established to provide opportunities for school leaders to meet together to share successes and challenges.

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.

During 2009-2010, 1003 (g) funds were predominately used to provide training and materials for MDOE school improvement consultants. Training focused on the "Correlates of Effective schools" as outlined by Lawrence Lazotte. The consultants also participated in book studies related to improvement topics. Books reviewed including Annual Growth, Instructional Rounds, Catch up Growth and Ahead of the Curve. These discussions allowed consultants to become familiar with resources that could then be recommended to school level teams. Training related to data studies was also provided. As a result of this initial data training, more extensive training using the Data Coach's Guide by Research for Better Teaching (Nancy Love) was scheduled for August of 2010 and refresher/follow-up training in November and February of 2010. Our school consultants and 120 participants representing 30 CIPS schools attended this training. To ensure school administrator involvement in our data planning and CIPS processes we have implemented quarterly principal's network meetings. These events are designed to acquaint school administrators with successful educational practices and allow for a forum to ask questions and receive answers, support and assistance. The funds needed for evaluation activities are taken from Title I 1003 (a).

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.

In addition to activities supported by 1003(a) and 1003(g), Title I schools in improvement status participated in applicable statewide conferences and workshops focusing on a variety of topics including: administration of statewide assessments, including NECAP, MHSA, PAAP and WIDA ACCESS, review of Common Core, data driven decision making, standards based instruction, high school syllabus review, Response to Intervention, Student Assistance teams, and training for effective integration of technology with Maine's Laptop Initiative (MLTI). Some schools may have also benefited from professional development provided to Reading First schools.

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	17,385
Applied to transfer	N<20
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	N<20
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	\$ 5,500

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	29

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	3,947
Applied for supplemental educational services	501
Received supplemental educational services	490
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	\$ 367,798
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	54,813	53,418	97.5	1,395	2.5
All elementary classes	19,282	18,999	98.5	283	1.5
All secondary classes	35,531	34,419	96.9	1,112	3.1
In a rural state such as Maine, it is difficult to recruit to these areas because of lack of services and many times there are low salaries					

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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.

The State counts elementary classes so that a full day self-contained class equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	11.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	21.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	59.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	9.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	34.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	23.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	5,179	5,056	97.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	4,534	4,477	98.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,268	2,201	97.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	11,811	11,528	97.6
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high and low 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	58.4	34.3
Poverty metric used	Poverty quartiles are calculated using the method described below in C - Free and reduced lunch program counts are used for this calculation	
Secondary schools	58.7	32.3
Poverty metric used	Poverty quartiles are calculated using the method described below in C - Free and reduced lunch program counts are used for this calculation	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/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	French
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Two-way immersion	Fench
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Heritage language	Passamaquoddy
<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"/> No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	5,112
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.	4,271
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
Somali	1,729
Spanish; Castilian	564
Arabic	345
French	335
Central Khmer	266

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	4,403
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	279
Total	4,682
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	244
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	5.5
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	3,776
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	143
Total	3,919
Comments: Maine's participation rate has improved tremendously. Of those not tested, the number reflects the continued issue of those who do not test in all domains, including those who are deaf and absenteeism among high school students.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	837

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	2,868	97.6	1,993	52.80
Attained proficiency	871	23.1	796	21.10
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)
none
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
none
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
none
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
148	104	252
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
244	191	78.3	53
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
242	206	85.1	36
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
116	74	63.8	42
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	13
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	12
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	13
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	2
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: For each consortia, consortia members are counted as ONE subgrantee. Maine had 4 different consortia, which are reflected in the total number of subgrantees. Only one consortia did not meet AMAO 1, so 3 consortia are counted in the subgrantees that met AMAO 1 and 4 consortia are counted as subgrantees that met AMAOs 2 and 3.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <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
294	10	1

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) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course - (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.	90
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

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	11	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	8	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	6	
Other (Explain in comment box)	2	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	11	871
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	175
PD provided to principals	10	67
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	7	77
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	8	335
PD provided to community based organization personnel	7	164
Total	13	1,689

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

using data to improve instruction and enhanced individualized programs for native language instructors to become highly qualified

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
07/01/10	8/10/10	30
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.

The state is moving to a reimbursement model.

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: The count for Maine is again zero (0) for 2009-10. Sources of Data: (1) Maine School Incidence of Prohibited Behavior Data on expulsions collected during 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 academic school years. (2) Maine Gun-Free Schools Reports collected during 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 school years.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	65.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	71.0
Hispanic	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	80.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	64.0
Limited English proficient	77.0
Economically disadvantaged	68.0
Migratory students	16.0
Male	77.0
Female	83.0
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In SY 2009-10, the state adopted the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) as the standard methodology for calculating graduation rate. This was the first year the state used a four-year cohort method to calculate graduation rate, and is likely the reason for any significant drop in graduation rate percentages. Fluctuations in graduation rate percentages due to changing graduation rate methodologies would be exacerbated in smaller subgroup populations.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4.1
Hispanic	3.8
White, non-Hispanic	3.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.5
Limited English proficient	3.2
Economically disadvantaged	5.8
Migratory students	13.3
Male	3.8
Female	3.0
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	239	239
LEAs with subgrants	3	3
Total	242	242
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)	N<20	N<20
K	54	N<20
1	37	N<20
2	40	N<20
3	49	N<20
4	41	N<20
5	43	N<20
6	33	N<20
7	35	N<20
8	53	N<20
9	50	47
10	65	120
11	106	87
12	130	111
Ungraded	N<20	32
Total	737	421
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	155	243
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	483	156
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	20	N<20
Hotels/Motels	79	N<20
Total	737	421
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<20
K	N<20
1	N<20
2	N<20
3	N<20
4	N<20
5	N<20
6	N<20
7	N<20
8	N<20
9	47
10	120
11	87
12	111
Ungraded	32
Total	421
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	325
Migratory children/youth	N<20
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	107
Limited English proficient students	N<20
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	3
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
Transportation	3
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	3
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
Coordination between schools and agencies	3
Counseling	3
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Employment 1 Life Skills/budgeting 1 Housing supports 1 Legal Proceedings 1
--

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	1
School Selection	0
Transportation	1
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Accessing documents for public assistance 1

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	N<20	N<20
4	N<20	N<20
5	N<20	N<20
6	N<20	N<20
7	N<20	N<20
8	N<20	N<20
High School	N<20	N<20
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	N<20	N<20
4	N<20	N<20
5	N<20	N<20
6	N<20	N<20
7	N<20	N<20
8	N<20	N<20
High School	N<20	N<20
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)	34
K	N<20
1	N<20
2	N<20
3	23
4	N<20
5	N<20
6	25
7	N<20
8	N<20
9	N<20
10	N<20
11	20
12	N<20
Ungraded	N<20
Out-of-school	35
Total	300
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 percentage decrease of the Category 1 Child Count is a direct result of more effective and better coordinated identification and recruitment efforts, accompanied by an extensive quality control system. In addition, a significant Spring frost damaged a good portion of the Blueberry crop, the agricultural activity that attracts and employs the largest percentage of migrants. As a result, the need for human capital decreased in great numbers having a direct result in our count.

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)	23
K	N<20
1	N<20
2	N<20
3	N<20
4	N<20
5	N<20
6	N<20
7	N<20
8	N<20
9	N<20
10	N<20
11	N<20
12	N<20
Ungraded	N<20
Out-of-school	N<20
Total	125
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.

Not applicable

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.

<p>The MDOE MEP data collection system is undergoing a transitional period. Through the 2009-2010 the MDOE MEP obtained data queries from the State's MIS2000 database, as it did last year, as well as through a newly established independent localized database; which was used primarily during and after Blueberry Harvest. The combination of the two generated the reports necessary to establish child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2.</p>

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.

How was the child count data collected?

Child count data were collected by state MEP staff and temporary recruiting staff.

What data were collected?

Personal Data: male and female parent/guardian first and last name; relationship; legal male and female parent last and first name; current address; current phone number (if available); work phone number (if available); permanent address; permanent phone; MIS2000 ID; student name first/middle/last1/last2/suffix grade; birth date; sex; age; place of birth (city/state/country), grade, multibirth flag, race and ethnicity.

Eligibility information:

Origin and destination of move qualifying move: 'From' (District, City, State, Country); 'To' (School District, city, State, country); QA Date (QAD); Current Residency Date; whether the child moved with or joined parents or moved on his/her own; name of qualifying worker; relation to child; in order to obtain qualifying work; temporary/seasonal work; agriculture or fishing industry; specific qualifying activity; reason for temporary (if applicable); basis of temporary determination (if applicable); additional comments (if applicable); signature of parent/guardian or eligible student (if qualifying worker); signature of recruiter; eligibility verification date and signature by state MEP Director or approval authority.

School and MEP project information:

current school or project; date of enrollment; type of services; total days enrolled; total days present; special services; withdrawal date; LEP or Special Education designation; graduation and drop out data is extracted from the state student data system.

Services:

Basic Services, Educational Needs/Services (i.e. Assistance with school registration, tutoring, parent/teacher conferences); Health/Social Referrals; Civic Referrals

Needs Assessment:

Basic Services, Educational and Instructional Needs, Health and Social Needs; Preschool Age Needs; Personal/Interest Needs (i.e. Nutritional Needs, House Stability)

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

Primary student data were collected on the COEs by MEP staff and temporary recruiters hired and trained by MEP staff and/or ESCORT staff for seasonal recruitment. The data were collected by means of personal interviews with parents and/or guardians during the school year and summer in Maine. Recruiters visited worker camps, crop sites, processing plants, homes, and schools to conduct interviews with potentially eligible families and workers. In some cases, preliminary phone interviews were conducted by recruiters to follow-up on school surveys to determine possible eligibility in order to schedule a personal interview to complete the COE.

The MEP contracted a year round full time ID&R recruiter/coordinator through ESCORT. In addition, two 15 week state recruiters and 4 temporary Summer recruiters through ESCORT were also hired during the Blueberry Harvest. Summer interviews were conducted by teams of two recruiters and COEs were cross-checked within the teams. COEs were then reviewed by the ESCORT ID&R coordinator and submitted to the MEP Education Specialist, followed by the Director or Approval Authority for verification. Any cases with questions, inconsistencies, or missing data were referred back to the ID&R Coordinator for clarification. Clarified COEs were then verified by the MEP Director or Approval Authority. Upon verification, during Blueberry Harvest by COEs were entered into MEP's independent localized database by one temporary summer staff person and in MIS2000 during the school year by MEP Director. After the Blueberry Harvest, COEs were entered by MEP Education Specialist into MEP localized database.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

Data were collected at the time of enrollment in a MEP program and upon identification of eligible workers during state-wide recruiting efforts throughout the year. Withdrawal data were collected at the time of outbound moves or, in the case of MEP projects, at the end of the project.

The same methods were used for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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.

Child count data points are input into MIS2000 or MEP's local independent database once the COE is finalized. In MIS2000, if the COE has not been signed by the Director or Approval Authority, the COE will be missing the designation "Y", which stands for: yes, verified and approved. In the independent localized database a status of "Pending" is input until final adjudication. Once the Approval Authority renders a final decision regarding eligibility, the status is changed to either, "Approved" or "Not Approved" and the database is updated accordingly.

The MEP used MIS200 during the 2009-2010 school year. The local independent database became operational with the beginning of Blueberry Harvest (July 2010) until the end of the reporting period (August 31st 2010)

The COE is the primary source for data-points in both databases. Additional data are collected on field scripts, needs assessment and service delivery records by the recruiters at the time of the interview or accessed through Maine's student information system (Infinite Campus). Once all verified COEs are input for the current reporting period, the data are extracted from the MIS2000 and MEP's independent localized database for use in CSPR reporting. 1.10.3.3.

For the 2009-10 MEP data, MEP staff reviewed each COE record for the reporting period and cross-referenced it with both summer attendance sheets and the State student information system to ensure the students in the data were present in Maine to determine Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts; presence was based on QAD, COE date or enrollment date during the reporting period.

Updates to data:

Updates to any data-point reviewed, when needed modified, and approved by the state Director or approval authority. Updates may occur based on information gathered either via follow-up phone calls to parents by MEP staff or trained temporary workers, or via personal interviews by state or seasonal recruiters.

The current data maintenance practices and procedures continue to be reviewed and revised in order to generate the most accurate counts and simplify the process for MEP staff.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on review of attendance sheets.

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.

Eligibility:

A report was run to include all the necessary data points required to complete both parts of the CSPR. The following is a list of data fields extracted for the initial CSPR report: Student ID, Last Name, First Name, Middle Name, Sex, Birth Date, Race, Birth City, Birth State, Birth Country, Qa Date, Coe Date, Eligible, COE ID, Res Date, Currentaddress, Current City, Current State Code, Zip, Phone, Curf Name 1, Curl Name 1, Curl Name 2, Curl Name 2, Homebaseaddr, Homebase City, Homebase State Code, Homebasezip, Homebase Country Code, From City, From State Code, From Country Code, To City, To State Code, Moved reason, Seasonaltemp Flag, Work Type, Worker Name, Facility Id, Facility Name, Enroll Date, Type __, Grade, Days Enr, Days Pres, Term Type, Term Date, Withdraw Date, School Year, Counselingyn, Advocacy, Computerskills Y/N, Dental, EDSuppliesYN, EnglishLanguageArtsYN, HealthSafteyYN, MathematicsYN, Nutrition, NeedsAssess, OtherYN, Other2Name, ReadingYN, ScienceYN, SocialStudiesHistoryYN, PupilTransport, Esllep, Specialed, Priorityforservice, Continuationofservice, Referredtootherservices, Receivedservice,

The MEP used MIS2000 and an independent localized database to generate the initial report for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts for 2009-10. The report produced a complete list of all students eligible during the reporting period. To be eligible for migrant services, there must be a qualifying move within 36 months of the first day of the reporting period. The first day of the reporting period for the 2009-10 report is 09/01/2009. Therefore, the 36 month window begins on 09/01/2006. The period ends on 08/31/2010. Once the date window is established, a query is generated from MIS2000 based on Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) between 09/01/2005 and 08/31/2009. Followed by the data pulled from our localized independent database that contains entries and COE dates from 7/27/10 until 8/31/2010.

The following data elements are accessed through the State Student Information System: Dropout, GED, State Assessment, School data. LEP and IDEA data from MIS2000 are cross validated with the state student database.

If the "eligible" field in MIS2000 is not populated with a "Y" (indicating the child was verified as eligible) or if the COE populated in the independent localized shows a "pending" status the COE is physically checked to determine eligibility. If the child is eligible based on physical examination of the COE, the database and spreadsheet are updated accordingly.

Age/Grade:

Age was calculated as of 8/31/10. The initial data report selected students whose birthdate was less than or equal to the report period end-date and those whose twenty-second birthdate was greater than or equal to the start-date of the reporting period. Children under the age of 3 as of 8/31/10 were not included in either Category 1 or Category 2 counts, however individual data was collected for use in reporting for the CSPR Part II. Grade was based on reported grade during summer program for Canadian residents and enrollment date as of 8/31/09 for Maine enrolled students..

Residence/Presence:

The initial data report filtered the following data points for a date within the reporting period: enrollment date, QAD, residence date, termination date, funding date, withdraw date, or COE date. Additional parameters specified that the termination date hold a value of null or greater than or equal to the start-date of the reporting period. Attendance rosters from migrant projects were reviewed to verify presence, COE dates between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10, as well as confirmation of an Infinite Campus enrollment date in a Maine school represented the primary sources to account for presence within Maine during the reporting period. Any students who were not verifiably present in the state during the reporting period were removed from the primary student list.

Served:

In order to compile a count of served eligible migrants, MEP used the enrollment data from the Blueberry Harvest School and the attendance roster from the local OSY service provider. MEP did not serve any migrants during the 2009-2010 school year.

Data Validation:

As with past years counts the MEP staff requested that State data staff run a match report to compare MIS2000 data with State Student Information System to verify which eligible migrant students enrolled for at least one day in Maine schools during the reporting period. The resultant matches are included in the Category 1 count. Once final validation is complete, all migrant related data is sent to EDFacts for CSPR finalization.

For the 2009-10 reporting period, a tandem, independent, third-party number count validation was also utilized to ensure a match and verification of all data-points.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on review of attendance sheets.

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.

During 2009-2010, the Maine MEP put a full time ID&R Coordinator in place that covered the entire state via SUNY/ESCORT in order to undergo broader and more comprehensive ID&R efforts. In addition, as part of this outreach effort, the Maine MEP utilized two State seasonal 15 week recruiters and three recruiters from ESCORT during blueberry harvest.

Training and orientation for all recruiters was provided through ESCORT, in collaboration with the Maine MEP.

Orientation for Maine State and ESCORT recruiters included:

- Overview of the Maine Migrant Education Program;
- Overview of qualifying agricultural and fishing industries in Maine;
- Current regulations
- Identifying migrant students and Out-of-School Youth
- Role of the Maine Project Recruiter;
- Review of Maine MEP services;
- Overview of typical daily recruiting schedule and routine;
- Review of the Maine COE;
- Review of documentation and reporting procedures; and,
- Overview of logistics and resources.

The SEA uses a standard, triplicate COE to collect consistent data on eligible students. The COE is signed by both recruiter and parent. During the summer of 2010, the COE was reviewed by the ID&R Coordinator before being submitted to the Education Specialist for a secondary review before final submission to the State MEP Director or approval authority for verification. A copy is available for parents and LEAs and the original is filed at the state MEP office.

Each COE completed during the 2009-10 school year via personal interview was reviewed by the state recruiter, temporary staff, an education specialist, the MEP director or approval authority. Eligibility was validated by the State Director or Approval Authority prior to inclusion in any data counts. If any information seemed unclear or incomplete, the recruiters returned to the field to follow-up with the workers and obtain additional clarifying information. In the event that questions were identified after the close of the Migrant Project, MEP staff followed-up with telephone calls or face-to-face interviews to workers to obtain clarification. In the event that clarification/qualification could not be obtained and there was no resolution prior completing eligibility documentation, the students were not included in the child count.

The Maine MEP currently requires that the person who interviews the family signs the COE before it is entered into MIS2000 or MEP's independent localized database.

The State MEP uses a robust quality assurance approach to ensure data quality by contracting an independent, third-party validation of all migrant counts for the 2009-10 CSPR submission. The final outcome is a verifiable process that produced Category I and Category II data in 2009-2010 that is both accurate and credible.

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.

The MEP did not conduct a formal re-interview process during 2009-2010. The MEP plans to undergo a re-interviewing process in 2011, most likely, during Blueberry Harvest

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 Maine MEP continues to evaluate and develop its data management procedures. During the reporting period, information was entered into MIS2000 or MEP's independent localized database directly from the COEs by either the Education Specialist II at the State or a temporary contracted assistant. Following review, verification and validation of student eligibility by the Education Specialist, the State MEP Director or the Approval Authority. Any questions on individual COEs were addressed by the State Director, the Education Specialist, ID&R Coordinator, state recruiters, or contracted staff with oversight from the State MEP director or Approval Authority. Questions were resolved prior to inclusion in any state counts.

The state of Maine utilizes two databases as its primary data source for all reports - MIS2000 and an independent localized database. In 2011, the MEP intends to begin the process of integrating its data into MSIX.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEP conducts an extensive process of cross referencing the available and validated data. As a system of checks and balances, for the 2009-10 MEP counts, MEP staff reviewed each COE record for the reporting period and cross-referenced with both summer attendance sheets and the State student information system to ensure the students in the data were eligible and present in Maine to determine Category 1 and 2. Finally, for the 2009-2010 reporting period, Maine had an independent third party review to validate the data-points.

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.

Conduct a 100% random re-interviewing process in 2011.
Conduct selected re-interviews as needed.
Enhance on-site recruiter training for 2011 blueberry harvest.
Continue improvements to our system to input, collect and upload data.
Continue data review with state Data Management Team to streamline the data collection process so the MEP database (MIS2000) and state database (Infinite Campus) can interface
Develop an Administrative Handbook for migrant data management.
Continue to have an independent, third-party review and validation of CSPR data points.
Identify critical data points necessary for the state migrant database to interface with MSIX

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 MEP continues to work with the State Office of Information Technology to create a more streamlined data collection and management system that utilizes existing student data from the State system to supplement the MEP-specific data collection needs of the program. In addition, one of the goals for 2011 is to finally integrate Maine's data into MSIX.

In terms of the accuracy of reported data for 2009-10, MEP staff has utilized supplemental methods to ensure that the counts submitted are correct, as well as an independent third-party analysis of our process with CSPR data count validation.