

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**

MICHIGAN



**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
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Michigan Department of Education		
Address: PO Box 30008 Lansing MI 48909		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Ryan Starkweather		
Telephone: 517-373-4872		
Fax: 517-373-4872		
e-mail: starkweatherR1@michigan.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Ryan Starkweather		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 1:36:00 PM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESMENT 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.

Michigan is one of the 48 states participating in the Common Core State Standards which will result in changes in both Math and ELA standards by August 2010.

Changes were made to the mathematics content expectations specific to Algebra II in December 2009.

Expect to start implementing the Common Core State Standards in Math and ELA in 2011.

No revisions or changes to Science content standards.

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.

There will be changes regarding the writing portion of the ELA assessments. Beginning in the Fall of 2010, writing will only be assessed on the MEAP in grades 4 and 7. Beginning in the Spring of 2011, writing will only be assessed on the MME in grade 11.

Michigan is also working with a consortium of states to explore the development of common ELA and Math assessments.

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

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

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	30.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	70.0
Comments:	

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

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	831,408		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,411		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	22,585		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	161,482	156,101	96.7
Hispanic	38,998		>97
White, non-Hispanic	589,973		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	116,684		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	34,176		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	387,097		>97
Migratory students	2,012	1,902	94.5
Male	425,039		>97
Female	406,369		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	47,548	41.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	41,004	36.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,369	5.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	18,717	16.5
Total	113,638	
Comments:		

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	831,694		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,418		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	22,587		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	161,577	156,721	97.0
Hispanic	39,001		>97
White, non-Hispanic	590,148		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	116,852		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34,175	32,675	95.6
Economically disadvantaged students	387,281		>97
Migratory students	2,010		>97
Male	425,221		>97
Female	406,473		>97

Comments: In N093 this total includes those students that had taken ELPA and counted for participation in AYP for Reading there were 10 students where this happened.

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	60,754	53.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,931	22.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	7,703	6.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	19,705	17.3
Total	114,093	

Comments: In N081 we do not include ELPA students in reading counts that is why there is a 10 student difference.

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	356,222		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,195		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,067		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	67,559	63,809	94.4
Hispanic	15,159		>97
White, non-Hispanic	257,203		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	48,372	45,995	95.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,654		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	154,054		>97
Migratory students	680	625	91.9
Male	181,105		>97
Female	175,117		>97
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,762	38.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	20,099	43.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,134	17.7
Total	45,995	
Comments:		

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	116,222	109,523	94.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	985	908	92.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,544		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	22,678	19,752	87.1
Hispanic	6,280	5,750	91.6
White, non-Hispanic	80,831	77,870	96.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,041	13,624	84.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,280	6,655	91.4
Economically disadvantaged students	59,219	54,034	91.2
Migratory students	338	305	90.2
Male	59,745	56,235	94.1
Female	56,477	53,288	94.4
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,122	103,405	89.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	986	827	83.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,455	3,274	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22,710	18,166	80.0
Hispanic	6,270	5,249	83.7
White, non-Hispanic	80,797	74,210	91.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,067	11,199	69.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,080	5,772	81.5
Economically disadvantaged students	59,167	49,496	83.7
Migratory students	344	272	79.1
Male	59,698	51,871	86.9
Female	56,424	51,534	91.3
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
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:			

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	117,326	107,814	91.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	983	875	89.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,510	3,395	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,048	18,886	81.9
Hispanic	6,148	5,470	89.0
White, non-Hispanic	81,899	77,610	94.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,118	13,711	80.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,212	5,376	86.5
Economically disadvantaged students	58,695	51,378	87.5
Migratory students	394	346	87.8
Male	59,899	54,643	91.2
Female	57,427	53,171	92.6
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	117,252	97,855	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	988	819	82.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,421	3,087	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,091	15,788	68.4
Hispanic	6,156	4,541	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	81,855	72,214	88.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,159	10,324	60.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,021	3,865	64.2
Economically disadvantaged students	58,672	44,174	75.3
Migratory students	406	275	67.7
Male	59,855	48,677	81.3
Female	57,397	49,178	85.7
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:			

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	116,865	92,499	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,062	760	71.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,204	2,968	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22,890	14,319	62.6
Hispanic	5,802	4,120	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	82,297	69,080	83.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,390	9,828	56.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,371	3,627	67.5
Economically disadvantaged students	57,982	40,474	69.8
Migratory students	337	243	72.1
Male	59,822	47,300	79.1
Female	57,043	45,199	79.2
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	116,849	98,790	84.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,067	876	82.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,130	2,820	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic	22,928	16,082	70.1
Hispanic	5,817	4,325	74.4
White, non-Hispanic	82,298	73,352	89.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,428	10,512	60.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,209	3,218	61.8
Economically disadvantaged students	57,974	44,174	76.2
Migratory students	344	237	68.9
Male	59,814	49,521	82.8
Female	57,035	49,269	86.4
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	116,555	93,864	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,054	808	76.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,195	2,823	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22,767	13,527	59.4
Hispanic	5,765	3,953	68.6
White, non-Hispanic	82,178	71,491	87.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,095	10,419	60.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,361	3,038	56.7
Economically disadvantaged students	57,710	40,632	70.4
Migratory students	326	210	64.4
Male	59,665	47,935	80.3
Female	56,890	45,929	80.7
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	118,414	96,633	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,121	866	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,233	3,021	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,265	14,540	62.5
Hispanic	5,733	4,321	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	83,424	72,586	87.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,027	9,576	56.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,579	3,148	68.7
Economically disadvantaged students	57,425	41,607	72.5
Migratory students	259	179	69.1
Male	61,007	49,188	80.6
Female	57,407	47,445	82.6
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	118,384	103,163	87.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,119	948	84.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,168	2,961	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23,314	17,599	75.5
Hispanic	5,742	4,695	81.8
White, non-Hispanic	83,404	75,552	90.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,078	10,764	63.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,387	3,059	69.7
Economically disadvantaged students	57,407	46,290	80.6
Migratory students	278	213	76.6
Male	60,998	51,710	84.8
Female	57,386	51,453	89.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	119,518	97,486	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,096	857	78.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,178	2,955	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	23,213	14,464	62.3
Hispanic	5,365	4,009	74.7
White, non-Hispanic	85,058	73,963	87.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,899	9,160	54.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,244	2,791	65.8
Economically disadvantaged students	56,564	40,757	72.1
Migratory students	266	180	67.7
Male	61,153	49,569	81.1
Female	58,365	47,917	82.1
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	119,558	97,714	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,103	873	79.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,116	2,796	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,301	15,076	64.7
Hispanic	5,369	3,838	71.5
White, non-Hispanic	85,063	73,891	86.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,965	9,226	54.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,102	2,240	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	56,608	40,981	72.4
Migratory students	281	168	59.8
Male	61,193	48,527	79.3
Female	58,365	49,187	84.3
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:			

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	119,843	84,118	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,116	702	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,022	2,672	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22,547	10,282	45.6
Hispanic	5,231	3,109	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	86,504	66,433	76.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,469	6,557	39.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,055	2,058	50.8
Economically disadvantaged students	54,668	31,006	56.7
Migratory students	263	132	50.2
Male	61,187	42,755	69.9
Female	58,656	41,363	70.5
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	119,902	99,759	83.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,121	906	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,958	2,683	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22,633	16,092	71.1
Hispanic	5,225	3,999	76.5
White, non-Hispanic	86,542	74,955	86.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,553	9,185	55.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,874	2,372	61.2
Economically disadvantaged students	54,708	41,116	75.2
Migratory students	272	190	69.9
Male	61,232	48,495	79.2
Female	58,670	51,264	87.4
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	119,508	90,274	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,114	782	70.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,014	2,607	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	22,418	11,162	49.8
Hispanic	5,188	3,367	64.9
White, non-Hispanic	86,354	71,375	82.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,184	7,256	44.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,024	1,949	48.4
Economically disadvantaged students	54,434	34,221	62.9
Migratory students	254	130	51.2
Male	61,020	45,421	74.4
Female	58,488	44,853	76.7
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	111,702	56,891	50.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	941	375	39.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,749	1,981	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,460	3,379	18.3
Hispanic	3,780	1,318	34.9
White, non-Hispanic	84,840	49,423	58.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,694	3,109	24.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,002	364	18.2
Economically disadvantaged students	39,357	12,695	32.3
Migratory students	45	15	33.3
Male	55,569	29,592	53.3
Female	56,133	27,299	48.6
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	112,394	73,779	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	945	567	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,753	2,067	75.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,744	7,353	39.2
Hispanic	3,803	1,960	51.5
White, non-Hispanic	85,206	61,221	71.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,833	4,716	36.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,002	464	23.2
Economically disadvantaged students	39,753	19,877	50.0
Migratory students	46	18	39.1
Male	55,950	35,258	63.0
Female	56,444	38,521	68.2
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	112,027	65,129	58.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	945	480	50.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,749	1,955	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,624	4,652	25.0
Hispanic	3,787	1,521	40.2
White, non-Hispanic	84,988	56,034	65.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,716	3,590	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,007	289	14.4
Economically disadvantaged students	39,543	15,706	39.7
Migratory students	45	12	26.7
Male	55,720	33,119	59.4
Female	56,307	32,010	56.8
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	3,624	3,243	89.5
Districts	554	525	94.8
Comments:			

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	2,063	1,942	94.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,107	1,021	92.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	956	921	96.3
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
762	514	67.5
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	12
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	6
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	3
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	37
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	2
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	36
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.

Appoint/employ an independent "turn around specialist." Appoint a Governing Board to oversee the school. Close the school and re-open it as a completely restructured school of choice within district governance. Use an external research-based reform model that addresses the issues of alternative governance. Appoint a new principal.
Suspend the office of the Principal.

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.

There were five districts identified for improvement. Of these, three were intermediate school districts (ISDs) that run alternative education programs for constituent LEAs under their county-level jurisdiction. Of the remaining two, one is a strict discipline academy (SDA).

The ISDs provide support to identified schools in their jurisdiction. In the case of the ISDs that were identified, the school improvement or high priority school ISD staff provided supports to their own programs. The same was true for the SDA, it was supported by the local ISD.

The remaining district that was identified had the largest number of individual schools also identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. This district received support and technical assistance from the SEA in coordinating supports to their identified schools through the following: Technical assistance from their local ISD; budgetary guidance from the SEA; academic and leadership support from the SEA and its partners in the statewide system of support.

ISDs provided continuous school improvement mentor teams to each identified school. In the case of the identified traditional LEA, the mentor team included district level members responsible for coordinating improvement efforts at the district level with the initiatives taking place in the identified school buildings.

In all cases ongoing support was provided throughout the school year.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: No districts were identified for corrective action in the 2009-10 school year.	

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	10	10
Schools	497	332
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	07/28/10
---	----------

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	34,488	36,461
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	15,888	16,161
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	46.1	44.3
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	34,766	36,087
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	19,472	15,957
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	56.0	44.2
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	137
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	10

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

Comments:

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
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		135	10	40	A	
2		135	10	40	A	
3		135	10	40	A	
4		135	10	40	A	
Comments:						

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

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools receiving funding are required to participate in the listed activities as a condition of receiving funds. Intermediate School Districts (ISDs), which are county level LEAs, provide direct support to LEAs (school districts) within their jurisdiction. The ISDs contact their locals directly with training and TA opportunities available locally. The SEA reviews grant awards to ensure that funds are used only for allowable approved activities that meet the strategies outlined in section 1.4.8.3.

The SEA also engaged in partnerships with Michigan State University (MSU), Kent ISD (KISD), and the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA) to provide training and technical assistance in continuous school improvement, leadership, mathematics and reading, and use of data to inform all the preceding supports.

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.

Michigan did not use any Section 1003(g) funds to support the evaluation and technical assistance. Other funds were used to support to these activities.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State did not have any other funding available to support these activities.

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	91,602
Applied to transfer	570
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	338
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	\$ 161,473

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	46

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	59,932
Applied for supplemental educational services	21,478
Received supplemental educational services	15,722
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	\$ 20,492,511
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	238,976	238,252	99.7	724	0.3
All elementary classes	60,586	60,509	99.9	77	0.1
All secondary classes	178,390	177,743	99.6	647	0.4

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

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

Michigan counts elementary classes so that a full day self-contained classroom counts as ONE CLASS.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	78.0
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	22.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 238,976 classes in Michigan, 77 (0.03%) are taught by non-HQ elementary teachers. Of those 77 classes, 78% are general education and 22% are special education classes. While the numbers indicate a higher percentage of general education teachers unable to demonstrate HQ, it is important to note that the total number of special education classes statewide (4,914) is considerably lower than general education (55,672) which makes the 22% more significant.

	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)	46.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	54.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 238,976 classes in Michigan, 647 (0.27%) are taught by non-HQ secondary teachers. Of those 647 classes, 46% are general education and 54% are special education classes. This data is even more significant when you note that the total number of special education classes statewide (4,914) is considerably lower than general education (55,672). Special education teachers at the secondary level continue to be our area of focus due to the complexity of determining HQ status.

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	30,751	30,617	99.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	53,363	53,260	99.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	12,484	12,388	99.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	37,594	37,549	99.9
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	77.6	34.8
Poverty metric used	The percent of students eligible for free and reduced-priced meals at each school was calculated as the poverty rate. Elementary schools were then ranked among all the elementary schools in the state based on poverty rates to determine the poverty quartiles. If a poverty rate for a school was not available then the rate for the district was used. Data has been verified and is accurate.	
Secondary schools	64.9	30.5
Poverty metric used	The percent of students eligible for free and reduced-priced meals at each school was calculated as the poverty rate. Secondary schools were then ranked among all the secondary schools in the state based on poverty rates to determine the poverty quartiles. If a poverty rate for a school was not available then the rate for the district was used. Data has been verified and is accurate.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or*

secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III LANGUAGE AND 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
Yes	Dual language	Afrikkans, Albanian, Arabic, Bengali, Burmese, Carib, Chamorro, Chinese, Creole, Czech, Danish, French, German, Gujarati, Hmong, Hiri Motu, Hungarian, Igbo, Italian, Japanese, Kazakh, Korean, Lao
Yes	Two-way immersion	Albanian, Arabic, Bengali, Bosnian, Chinese, Gujarati, Kurdish, Polish, Romanian, Somali, Spanish, Thai, Urdu, Vietnamese
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Bengali, Bosnian, Burmese, Chinese, French, German, Gujarati, Hindi, Hmong, Igbo, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Lao, Macedonian, Malay, Polish, Pushto, Romanian, Russ
No Respon	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Albanian, Arabic, Burmese, Hindi, Japanese, Mayalayam, Russian, Spanish, Urdu
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No Respon	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No Respon	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	63,211
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.	63,917
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	29,753
Arabic	15,169
Albanian	1,594
Bengali	1,350
Chinese	1,178

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	54,499
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	7,995
Total	62,494
Comments: After surveying our districts, reasons for students not being tested include: error in identifying as LEP; exited by parent and LEA did not test; were absent during test window due to migrancy; had dropped out; had frequent absences; graduated early; moved prior to testing window and records were not updated correctly; were enrolled after the testing window; not tested due to IEP status; tests not mailed back in time to be counted; had exemption from testing.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16,784
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	30.8
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	53,616
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	7,780
Total	61,396
Comments: After surveying our districts, reasons for students not being tested include: error in identifying as LEP; exited by parent and LEA did not test; were absent during test window due to migrancy; had dropped out; had frequent absences; graduated early; moved prior to testing window and records were not updated correctly; were enrolled after the testing window; not tested due to IEP status; tests not mailed back in time to be counted; had exemption from testing.	
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.	13,783

1.6.3.2.2**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	27,934	70.1	28,759	75.00
Attained proficiency	16,503	30.8	5,410	10.00

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)
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
1,816	668	2,484
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
1,578	1,376	87.2	202
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
227	141	62.1	86
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
679	520	76.6	159
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	308
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	55
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	109
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	159
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	68
# - 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)	5
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	1

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Michigan counts each district separately and not as a consortia.

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> No
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
6,991	5,045	46

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	190
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	10

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	72	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	77	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	55	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	39	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	32	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	64	5,795
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	72	984
PD provided to principals	55	875
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	45	973
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	52	1,531
PD provided to community based organization personnel	20	700
Total	308	10,858

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/7/09	1/12/10	185
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.

As Michigan's data systems are updated, the time between the date of award and the date of distribution has, and will continue, to decrease.
--

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: There are zero persistently dangerous schools in Michigan.	

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.6
Black, non-Hispanic	56.4
Hispanic	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	81.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	57.3
Limited English proficient	65.4
Economically disadvantaged	59.6
Migratory students	59.0
Male	70.8
Female	79.9
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	11.1
Hispanic	7.5
White, non-Hispanic	3.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7.2
Limited English proficient	5.4
Economically disadvantaged	8.6
Migratory students	3.2
Male	6.0
Female	4.4
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 YOUTH PROGRAMS

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	222	84
LEAs with subgrants	622	456
Total	844	540
Comments: 74% of all LEAs in MI are subgrantees, participating in consortium grants. Approximately 64% of all LEAs in MI identified and reported homeless students being enrolled during the 2009-2010 school year.		

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)	52	535
K	177	1,901
1	102	1,609
2	150	1,586
3	133	1,529
4	119	1,495
5	113	1,465
6	90	1,323
7	75	1,285
8	98	1,208
9	63	1,477
10	72	1,444
11	73	1,403
12	142	2,356
Ungraded	N<10	111
Total	1,462	20,727

Comments: MI uses a regional grant consortium model for MW, which has lead to improved identification and reporting of homeless students this year. In combination with a new state student data system implemented in 2009-2010, this has improved the accuracy of our data on homeless students.

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	358	4,791
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	910	14,701
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	144	317
Hotels/Motels	50	918
Total	1,462	20,727

Comments: Michigan's new data system, implemented at the beginning of the 2009-2010 school year, has lead to improved accuracy and completeness of LEA reporting, particularly in this category (which was added to the data system for the first time).

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)	375
K	753
1	787
2	696
3	648
4	671
5	651
6	594
7	578
8	556
9	657
10	555
11	523
12	797
Ungraded	883
Total	9,724

Comments: A number of LEAs reported only district totals of homeless students, rather than by grade level. The total number of students included in LEA TOTALS REPORT is 12,597, making the actual total count of Homeless Students SERVED 22,321.

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	
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient students	

Comments: MI does not collect "SERVED" by subgroup. Rather than reporting "SERVED" data, 1.9.2.2 reflects "ENROLLED" data. MI's M-V Homeless subgrants are all regional consortium grants, with district member services coordinated by a regional grant coordinator. The needs of these populations are so specialized that they are universally served by all MI subgrantees, once identified as homeless. Therefore, in MI, the numbers of subgroup students would be virtually the same as the numbers enrolled.

ACTUAL SUBGROUP COUNTS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

Unaccompanied Youth - 2,626

Migratory Children/youth - 166

Children with Disabilities - 4,238

Limited English Proficient Students - 730

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	271
Expedited evaluations	127
Staff professional development and awareness	302
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	245
Transportation	345
Early childhood programs	128
Assistance with participation in school programs	278
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	234
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	258
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	331
Coordination between schools and agencies	374
Counseling	255
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	178
Clothing to meet a school requirement	402
School supplies	465
Referral to other programs and services	336
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	356
Other (optional – in comment box below)	218
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TOTAL OTHER SERVICES OFFERED: 218 Credit recovery services - 65 Extra-curricular activities support/fees - 33 Graduation caps & gowns - 92 Field trip fees - 13 Food support - 7 Personal hygiene kits - 5 Miscellaneous - parking pass, emergency auto repair, drivers license fee, etc. - 3
--

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	122
School Selection	85
Transportation	199
School records	62
Immunizations	33
Other medical records	13
Other Barriers – in comment box below	135

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

OTHER BARRIERS IDENTIFIED: Housing - lack of affordable housing - 45 Lack of shelter options & waiting lists for HUD housing - 29 Sharing of information between between agencies & liaisons - inconsistent/missing - 25 Families & youth without telephones - unable to contact - 8 Suspensions/expulsions of students with ADHD and behavioral problems - 2 LEA attendance policies - waiting to be revised, refusal to revise, etc. - 4 Access to medical & mental health care for UY - legal & policy barriers - 12 Lack of child care/fees for child care for homeless children - no funding for care - 5 Lack of graduation fees and supplies (invitations, post-grad school events) - 5

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	962	755
4	887	625
5	926	669
6	767	600
7	839	571
8	738	549
High School	725	322

Comments: Data for state assessments can only be obtained for Homeless Students ENROLLED, not for Homeless Students SERVED, and is reported above.

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	962	857
4	885	774
5	925	597
6	758	509
7	834	556
8	732	374
High School	720	180

Comments: Data for state assessments can only be obtained for Homeless Students ENROLLED, not for Homeless Students SERVED, and is reported above.

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)	1,238
K	608
1	566
2	503
3	466
4	458
5	385
6	373
7	386
8	369
9	347
10	274
11	187
12	123
Ungraded	176
Out-of-school	228
Total	6,687

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.

!No explanation provided.

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)	717
K	424
1	415
2	351
3	321
4	292
5	247
6	202
7	188
8	174
9	114
10	52
11	50
12	N<10
Ungraded	111
Out-of-school	18
Total	3,682
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.

!No explanation provided.

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.

Michigan used the Migrant Education Database System (MEDS) to generate the 2009-2010 Category1 child count and Category 2 child count. The MEDS is an online web-based custom system. This system has been in place since 2005-2006 and replaces one used by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) in earlier years.

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.

Each local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries to identify and recruit new families. In areas of the state where there are no local migrant programs, the MDE funds four State-Wide Identification and Recruitment projects to survey those areas.

In all cases, the recruiter interviews the families to determine eligibility. The data collected consists of the family data, child data and qualifying move and work data required by the National COE. If the family is deemed eligible, a paper National Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for that family. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The local migrant program director, or state-wide area director, reviews the COE for accuracy and completeness. The director signs the form if s/he finds that the COE is accurate and the family is eligible.

The 2009-2010 MEDS data was collected between September 1, 2009 and August 31, 2010.

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.

Once eligibility is verified, data-entry personnel enter the data from the paper COE into the MEDS. This electronic version of the COE is sent to the local migrant director. The local migrant director reviews the electronic COE and forwards it to the MDE for approval. At the MDE, one of two contracted staff reviews the electronic COE for accuracy. This is their primary job responsibility. If the electronic COE is incomplete or inaccurate it is returned to the local migrant program for corrections. Once the electronic COE is deemed complete and accurate it is approved by the MDE.

Enrollment and attendance data is updated on the MEDS if a student moves before the end of the term or school year. Typically, regular term enrollment/attendance information is obtained from the attendance office at the school where the migrant student attends. Summer term enrollment/attendance information is generated by the summer migrant program. In both instances, migrant staff enters the data into the MEDS.

New COE information is entered into the MEDS every time a family makes a new qualifying move.

For families that did not move during the year, recruiters visit the family and complete a new COE every 365 days. The new COE includes updated information for the family and a new parent signature. The updated information includes students' new grade levels, as well as, the names of children who may have moved to join or are a new addition to the family. Also noted are the names of children who have moved away. The updated COE is stapled to the previous COE.

The MEDS consolidates data from the individual programs. Data is now collected on an on-going basis. Since the MEDS is web-based, data is entered real-time. Data is organized in a relational database.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEDS includes reporting functions that are programmed to count only those children who meet eligibility criteria. For 2009-2010 only those children who:

- had an enrollment/identified date between 9/1/2009 and 8/31/2010
- had a birth date at least three years before their withdrawal/moved date
- had a birth date less than 22 years before their enrollment/identified date
- had not yet graduated or received a GED, and
- had a qualifying move within three years of their enrollment/identified date,

were included in Category 1 child counts.

The Category 2 child count report is programmed to count only those children, who in addition, to the five criteria listed above, were enrolled in a migrant summer program between 6/16/2010 and 8/31/2010 and had at least one day of attendance. Both the Category 1 and Category 2 MEDS child counts are unduplicated reports run with state-wide data.

The latest enhancement to the MEDS checks specifically for duplicates. The system does a pair-wise comparison of each student in the system. The system compares the first four letters of the last name and the first three letters of the first name. This generates a source student that is compared against all possible matches. If additional examination is required to eliminate possible duplications the names of parents, the birth date, the birth place, and the names of siblings are also compared. The MEDS also assigns a unique student identification number to every student in the database. In addition, we have established a process whereby students in the MEDS are matched to students in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) for the purpose of assigning a Unique Identifier Code (UIC).

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries to identify and recruit new families. In areas of the state where there are no local migrant programs, the MDE funds four State-Wide Identification and Recruitment projects to survey those areas. In all cases, the recruiter interviews the families to determine eligibility. The data collected consists of the family data, child data and qualifying move and work data required by the National COE. If the family is deemed eligible, a paper National Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for that family. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The local migrant program director, or state-wide area director, reviews the COE for accuracy and completeness. The director signs the form if s/he finds that the COE is accurate and the family is eligible. The COE is then given to the data entry specialist who inputs the information into the MEDS.

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 Re-Interview process for 2009-2010 is a continuation and an improvement of the re-interview process begun in 2003-2004. The training for the re-interviewers has been on-going and more focused. An analysis was done of the COEs recommended for disqualification during the 2003-2007 school years. The most common reasons for disqualification were qualifying moves older than 36 months, and performance of work that did not qualify; specifically, landscaping as opposed to nursery work. The training for recruiters focused on these areas and the re-interviewers report a decrease in these recruitment errors. The defect rate for Michigan for 2003-2004 was 7.91%. The defect rate for 2004-2005 was 2.77%, and for 2005-2006 it was 3.16%. The defect rate for 2006-2007 is 2.66%. The defect rate for 2007-08 was 1.87%. The defect rate for 2008-2009 was 1.66%. The defect rate for 2009-2010 is not finalized pending completion of the appeal process. For 2009-2010 the Re-Interview process was as follows:

- All LEA and State-Wide Identification and Recruitment projects were included in the re-interview process
- A random sampling of COEs were re-interviewed from each site
- The total number of COEs eligible for the re-interview process was 3,441
- A total of 184 COEs were re-interviewed
- A total of 15 were recommended for disqualification
- A total of 169 COEs were found eligible
- The appeal process for the 15 COEs recommended for disqualification is not complete at this time

For those districts that have a high number of COEs recommended for disqualification, the MDE will conduct an audit of all COEs from that district.

The training for re-interviewers has also been given to recruiters, data-entry personnel, secretaries, and migrant directors.

The training curriculum is based on:

- Information from the OME Conference on October 27-29, 2009
- OME Webinar and materials from June 2010
- Non-Regulatory Guidance of August 2010
- and specifically tailored for Michigan by the Michigan Migrant Education program staff

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 MEDS has a report function that districts can generate that allow them to compare the data that has been inputted into the system with the paper COE to check for accuracy.

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.

Local districts run reports in MEDS that match up with data requests in the CSPR then match that data with their own local data reports to ensure that all students have been entered into the system correctly and with the correct data required. If there are differences between the local migrant count and the state count, these differences are resolved on a program by program basis. Once the differences are resolved, the local migrant program counts are included in the state counts.

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.

Given the re-interview results and the district's error rate, the SEA will conduct a complete audit of all COEs generated by that district. The SEA will work with the local district personnel to correct the issues as well as provide re-training where necessary.

Also, the SEA has posted on its website, FAQs on eligibility are available to all districts and are updated as requirements and NRGs are updated.

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.

No explanation provided.