

**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**

**MINNESOTA**



**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: Minnesota Dept of Ed		
Address: 1500 Highway 36 W Roseville MN		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Sam Kramer		
Telephone: 651-582-8454		
Fax: 651-582-8727		
e-mail: samuel.kramer@state.mn.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): John Moorse		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 11:50:28 AM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

### STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

#### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in Language Arts (2003), Mathematics (2003) and Science (2004) were approved in Section 1 of the peer review process for the state's current set of assessments. Since that time, the following changes have been made or are planned in keeping with the standards review and revision schedule set forth in state law (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023):

- Minnesota actively participated in the Common Core State Standards Initiative for both English language arts and mathematics. The state convened teams of K-12 and postsecondary educators to review and provide detailed feedback on all drafts of the college and career readiness anchor standards and the K-12 standards in both subjects.
- Minnesota's 2003 Mathematics standards were revised in 2007. School districts are required to implement the revised math standards by the current (2010-2011) school year. The revised standards address mathematical skills and knowledge that prepare all students for college and careers. The 2010 standards help define the mathematics requirements for credit and high school graduation: "three credits [three years] of mathematics, encompassing at least algebra, geometry, statistics, and probability sufficient to satisfy the academic standard" (Minn. Stat. 120B.024 (a)(2)). The revised standards also reflect new requirements in which "students must satisfactorily complete an algebra I credit by the end of eighth grade" (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023, subd. 2(b)(1)); and "students scheduled to graduate in the 2014-2015 school year or later must satisfactorily complete an algebra II credit or its equivalent" in order to graduate from high school (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023, subd. 2(b)(2)). Minnesota has not adopted the Common Core mathematics standards at this time. The commissioner does not have authority to adopt new mathematics standards until the 2015-2016 school year (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023, subd. 2(b)(2)); therefore, adoption of the Common Core mathematics standards would require legislative action.
- Minnesota's 2004 Science standards were revised in 2009. School districts are required to implement the revised science standards by the 2011-2012 school year. The revised standards address science and engineering skills and knowledge that prepare all students for college and careers. The revised standards help define the science requirements for credit and high school graduation: "three credits of science in high school, including at least one credit in biology" (MS 120B.024). The revised standards also reflect a new requirement in which "students scheduled to graduate in the 2014-2015 school year or later must satisfactorily complete a chemistry or physics credit [as part of the three-credit requirement]" (Minn. Stat. § 120B.023, subd. 2(d)). Minnesota's revised science standards feature substantive engineering design process standards across the K-12 grade span, consistent with leading states' efforts to address the increased importance of STEM (science, technology, engineering and math in an integrated way) in our modern scientific world.
- Minnesota's 2003 Language Arts\* standards were reviewed and revised in 2010. The revised standards include all of the Common Core ELA standards word-for-word plus additional content. School districts are required to implement the revised (2010) English language arts standards by the 2012-2013 school year. The revised standards help define the requirement of "four credits of language arts" for high school graduation (Minn. Stat. § 120B.024 (a)(1)).

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state plans to revise its assessment system according to the revision cycle identified in state statute 120B.30. The state assessment system must be aligned to the most recent revision of academic standards as described in section 120B.023 in the following manner: mathematics-grades 3 through 8 beginning in the 2010-2011 school year; and high school level beginning in the 2013-2014 school year; and language arts and reading; grades 3 through 8 and high school level beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. The state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards will be revised according to this same cycle. New achievement standards for all tests are expected to be established in the year of implementation. The state's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards is scheduled to be operational in 2010-2011 in grades 5-8 and high school for reading and math. New achievement standards for all tests are expected to be established in the year of implementation.

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)	20.0
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	80.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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"/> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<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
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT

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	429,021		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,261	8,979	97.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,082		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	41,157		>97
Hispanic	27,783		>97
White, non-Hispanic	323,738		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	60,300		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,299		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	154,580		>97
Migratory students	664		>97
Male	219,894		>97
Female	209,127		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	36,979	62.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,836	26.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,245	10.6
Total	59,060	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	429,152		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,363		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,225		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	41,358		>97
Hispanic	28,209		>97
White, non-Hispanic	322,997		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	60,690		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32,130		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	156,095		>97
Migratory students	670	647	96.6
Male	219,911		>97
Female	209,241		>97

**Comments:** 1.2.4 File N093 contains N<10 students who are "recently arrived LEP students who took the ELP in lieu of the reading/language arts assessment". These students are not in file N081.

### 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	50,909	85.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,329	3.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,342	10.6
Total	59,580	

**Comments:** 1.2.4 File N093 contains 5 students who are "recently arrived LEP students who took the ELP in lieu of the reading/language arts assessment". These students are not in file N081.

### 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	384,590	179,745	46.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,790	3,545	45.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	23,468	11,122	47.4
Black, non-Hispanic	35,613	16,158	45.4
Hispanic	21,147	10,880	51.4
White, non-Hispanic	296,572	138,040	46.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	52,541	23,958	45.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,051	11,506	54.7
Economically disadvantaged students	124,686	61,309	49.2
Migratory students	489	244	49.9
Male	197,799	92,115	46.6
Female	186,791	87,630	46.9

**Comments:** The denominators for grade 5 and 8 science assessments are the number of students enrolled in grades 5 and 8. The denominator for the high school life science end of course assessment is the count of students enrolled in the high school. The numerator for the for grade 5 and 8 science assessments are the number of students who participated in the grades 5 and 8 assessments. The numerator for the high school end of course life science assessment is the count of students who participated in the assessment. High school students take the assessment after completing their high school life science course. The life science course might be taken during any of the students four years in high school. Thus, the high school participation rate appears to show approximately one-fourth of the high school enrollment participating. This artificially low high school number suppresses the state's 2009 Science participation rate.

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	20,318	84.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,070	4.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,570	10.7
Total	23,958	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

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

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,835	49,286	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,352	891	65.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,082	3,050	74.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,369	3,590	56.4
Hispanic	4,726	2,890	61.2
White, non-Hispanic	44,306	38,865	87.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,694	4,987	57.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,317	3,563	56.4
Economically disadvantaged students	24,013	16,221	67.6
Migratory students	107	51	47.7
Male	31,181	25,390	81.4
Female	29,654	23,896	80.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,767	46,350	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,359	813	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,058	2,660	65.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,342	3,353	52.9
Hispanic	4,708	2,473	52.5
White, non-Hispanic	44,300	37,051	83.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,684	4,163	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,235	2,713	43.5
Economically disadvantaged students	23,955	14,650	61.2
Migratory students	105	50	47.6
Male	31,126	23,026	74.0
Female	29,641	23,324	78.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,186	45,251	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,339	734	54.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,054	2,904	71.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,172	2,980	48.3
Hispanic	4,282	2,247	52.5
White, non-Hispanic	44,339	36,386	82.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,215	4,549	49.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,493	2,512	45.7
Economically disadvantaged students	23,241	13,790	59.3
Migratory students	93	38	40.9
Male	30,872	23,029	74.6
Female	29,314	22,222	75.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,118	43,629	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,340	693	51.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,036	2,464	61.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6,141	2,945	48.0
Hispanic	4,266	2,128	49.9
White, non-Hispanic	44,335	35,399	79.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,213	4,247	46.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,409	1,981	36.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,192	12,956	55.9
Migratory students	95	37	38.9
Male	30,839	21,913	71.1
Female	29,279	21,716	74.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,800	40,245	67.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,272	601	47.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,766	2,407	63.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,921	2,249	38.0
Hispanic	4,241	1,795	42.3
White, non-Hispanic	44,600	33,193	74.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,135	3,569	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,949	1,794	36.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,640	11,158	49.3
Migratory students	89	34	38.2
Male	30,654	20,624	67.3
Female	29,146	19,621	67.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,773	45,653	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,280	759	59.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,737	2,490	66.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,905	3,135	53.1
Hispanic	4,224	2,309	54.7
White, non-Hispanic	44,627	36,960	82.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,153	4,224	46.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,862	2,016	41.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,618	13,793	61.0
Migratory students	88	39	44.3
Male	30,650	22,278	72.7
Female	29,123	23,375	80.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,072	27,441	46.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,242	275	22.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,749	1,182	31.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,826	1,117	19.2
Hispanic	4,226	791	18.7
White, non-Hispanic	44,029	24,076	54.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,992	2,551	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,926	425	8.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,371	6,117	27.3
Migratory students	93	11	11.8
Male	30,297	14,516	47.9
Female	28,775	12,925	44.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,710	40,353	67.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,362	600	44.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,645	2,406	66.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,662	2,087	36.9
Hispanic	3,817	1,569	41.1
White, non-Hispanic	45,224	33,691	74.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,307	2,929	35.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,206	1,392	33.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,919	10,750	49.0
Migratory students	96	32	33.3
Male	30,323	20,394	67.3
Female	29,387	19,959	67.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,667	42,800	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,355	710	52.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,635	2,209	60.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,645	2,656	47.1
Hispanic	3,809	1,848	48.5
White, non-Hispanic	45,223	35,377	78.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,312	3,211	38.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,159	1,273	30.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,894	11,983	54.7
Migratory students	94	33	35.1
Male	30,317	21,060	69.5
Female	29,350	21,740	74.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,849	38,443	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,314	505	38.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,779	2,328	61.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,580	1,840	33.0
Hispanic	3,899	1,494	38.3
White, non-Hispanic	46,277	32,276	69.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,232	2,228	27.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,828	1,054	27.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,620	9,389	43.4
Migratory students	99	30	30.3
Male	31,201	19,482	62.4
Female	29,648	18,961	64.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,853	40,365	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,320	588	44.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,776	2,057	54.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,573	2,319	41.6
Hispanic	3,885	1,598	41.1
White, non-Hispanic	46,299	33,803	73.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,251	2,686	32.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,783	740	19.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,603	10,190	47.2
Migratory students	99	28	28.3
Male	31,207	19,751	63.3
Female	29,646	20,614	69.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,471	34,711	57.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,280	382	29.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,744	2,091	55.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,445	1,481	27.2
Hispanic	3,527	1,091	30.9
White, non-Hispanic	46,475	29,666	63.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,001	1,638	20.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,538	769	21.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,798	7,686	37.0
Migratory students	93	19	20.4
Male	30,933	17,392	56.2
Female	29,538	17,319	58.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	60,463	41,354	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,275	624	48.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,732	2,228	59.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,431	2,450	45.1
Hispanic	3,523	1,567	44.5
White, non-Hispanic	46,502	34,485	74.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,997	2,641	33.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,486	856	24.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20,787	10,393	50.0
Migratory students	91	25	27.5
Male	30,935	19,954	64.5
Female	29,528	21,400	72.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	59,213	28,453	48.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,213	299	24.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,691	1,344	36.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,248	1,001	19.1
Hispanic	3,445	748	21.7
White, non-Hispanic	45,616	25,061	54.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,703	1,731	22.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,467	271	7.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20,222	5,640	27.9
Migratory students	86	10	11.6
Male	30,264	15,392	50.9
Female	28,949	13,061	45.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,406	27,321	43.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,060	195	18.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,812	1,498	39.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,215	704	13.5
Hispanic	2,881	504	17.5
White, non-Hispanic	50,438	24,420	48.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,476	994	13.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,657	199	7.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,371	4,157	22.6
Migratory students	68	N<10	10.3
Male	32,554	14,456	44.4
Female	30,852	12,865	41.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	63,757	48,202	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,211	674	55.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,856	2,349	60.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,398	2,493	46.2
Hispanic	3,277	1,651	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	50,015	41,035	82.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,965	3,230	40.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,174	811	25.6
Economically disadvantaged students	19,790	11,166	56.4
Migratory students	74	22	29.7
Male	32,700	24,629	75.3
Female	31,057	23,573	75.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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	61,460	31,961	52.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,090	317	29.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,682	1,515	41.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,084	1,015	20.0
Hispanic	3,209	757	23.6
White, non-Hispanic	48,395	28,357	58.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,263	1,634	22.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,113	295	9.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,716	5,834	31.2
Migratory students	65	N<10	13.8
Male	31,554	16,625	52.7
Female	29,906	15,336	51.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	2,288	1,060	46.3
Districts	542	225	41.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	867	405	46.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	275	75	27.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	592	330	55.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

##### 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
307	131	42.7
<b>Comments:</b> I believe the difference in Title I district counts stems from the 2009-10 data excluding Charter districts. In Minnesota legally independent charter schools are considered districts as well as schools. Submissions prior to the 2009-10 data included charter schools (i.e. districts).		

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

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

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	23
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	26
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	12
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2009-2010 was the fourth year of implementation for the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) regionally based Statewide System of Support (SSOS). The SSOS capitalizes on a regional service delivery model that provides technical assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and schools as required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The development of this model was based on research and best practices from other states as well as an extensive review of legislation, regulations and guidance to ensure compliance.

Rapid District Improvement - The emphasis in year four of the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) was to support the capacity of AYP districts to initiate and sustain rapid system-wide improvement. Rapid district improvement was defined as substantial changes in district structures, culture, policies and processes within 1-3 years; evidence of significant improvement in instructional practices and student performance within 3-4 years; and evidence that changes and improvements were system-wide and sustainable.

The MDE AYP Team reviewed (177) improvement plans submitted by AYP districts from across the state. Of the (177) AYP districts, (16) exited AYP and (46) made AYP at the end of 2009-10. Regional AYP Coordinators and district staff informally noted the following. They observed that schools and districts that exited or made AYP exhibited the following school reform elements:

- Proactive vs. reactive in overall approach
- Urgency noted in buildings about AYP (and student performance)
- Instructional leadership and/or leadership team is evident
- Analyzing data is an embedded practice; focus is on quantitative and qualitative data
- Alignment of curriculum with standards
- Implementation of job-embedded professional development
- Specifically providing for coaching to improve instructional practices
- Data reflecting fidelity of PD implementation
- Focused (not too many goals/initiatives)

To foster rapid district improvement, the regional AYP Coordinators' first priority was on-site consultation and customized professional development for (schools and) districts in corrective action (and schools in stages of restructuring). A second priority, as outlined in the USDE Guidance, was working with districts In Need of Improvement. To support rapid district improvement, AYP Coordinators were actively participating members on district improvement (leadership) teams. A central focus was the development of or updates to district improvement plans. High-quality and sustained job-embedded professional development continued to be delivered by service cooperatives to foster rapid district improvement. The regional service delivery model was purposeful in developing district capacity to lead and provide structure to ensure that schools were effective in increasing student achievement, especially for identified student groups. Professional development services were customized to meet the needs of eligible AYP districts (and schools), especially corrective action districts. Professional development funded through NCLB programs reflected the statutory set of principles that apply to Section 9101 (34) of NCLB.

AYP Coordinators delivered the following professional development services to continue building district capacity: quality indicator assessments; data analysis and data-informed school improvement planning; principal and teacher intervention dialogue and coaching frameworks for Special Education, English Language Learners, and Culturally Responsive training to help districts directly address their students' poverty-driven deficits. Districts' responsiveness to the needs of high-poverty, high-needs student populations they serve is a foundation for ongoing training. Response to Intervention training emphasized a continuum of student support and shared responsibility for student achievement. Sheltered Instruction training (SIOP) targeted research-based strategies for English Language Learners. Continuous improvement through collaboration and job embedded professional learning was provided through professional learning community training and critical team features including: Identifying and defining important and recursive instructional problems; planning and implementing instructional solutions, working towards detectable instructional improvements, specific cause-effect findings about teaching and learning, and using evidence to determine next steps about instruction.

All regional AYP Coordinators submitted monthly work reports to MDE indicating hours involved in on-site consultation and ongoing professional development activities for districts In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action. The reports included participation in the needs assessment process, goal setting, job-embedded professional development, data retreats, and other technical assistance specific to the request of the school/district.

Quarterly AYP Coordinator Meetings and Bi-monthly Regional Conference Calls -Strategies for working with schools should be as individualized as strategies for working with students. AYP Coordinators from across all regions of the state met at least quarterly to bring their own successes and challenges about what they had seen in schools and used their collective experiences, expertise, and research on successful practices to expand their differentiated work with districts in Corrective Action and In Need of Improvement. The summer AYP Coordinator meeting was specifically targeted on strategizing technical assistance and professional development to support rapid district improvement. Between quarterly meetings, regional conference calls were facilitated for continuing the dialogue on strategizing technical assistance and professional development.

Fiscal Services Support - the MDE AYP Team supervisor and financial specialist assigned to coordinate the 1003(a) funds were in regular contact with regional service cooperatives assigned staff to assure that funds were appropriately expended according to NCLB guidelines. In the spring of 2009, regional face-to-face meetings were provided with individual service cooperatives on the development of their 4th year application for provision of services through the SSOS.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	57
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	

**Comments:** MDE requires all Corrective Action districts to provide a 2 % programmatic set-aside. For 2009-10, (57) corrective action districts chose "Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds."

Corrective Action districts were required to provide an additional programmatic set-aside. Corrective Action districts were required to reserve a minimum of 2 percent of their Title I allocation for a programmatic set-aside (in addition to the 10% professional development set-aside required under NCLB). Districts were required to expend programmatic set-aside funds and implement improvement plan activities and services during the year of identification. District Improvement Plan activities or services were to supplement and not supplant existing initiatives (or are new) and included the following:

- Provide professional development (similar to parameters for 10% PD set-aside)
- Provide reading and/or math coordinators (similar to parameters for 10% PD set-aside)
- Incorporate strategies based on scientifically based research that will strengthen core academic subjects in the district and address specific academic issues that caused the district to be identified for corrective action (staff and resources necessary)
- Institute and fully implement a new curriculum aligned to state standards (districts in corrective action)
- Incorporate strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the district (staff and resources necessary)
- Adopt a comprehensive reform model, especially if the district in improvement was in search of an external structure and technical assistance that would help it identify and address organizational and instructional issues (staff and resources necessary to implement)

**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	15	0
Schools	20	0

**Comments:**

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/04/10
---	----------

**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 <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10		
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10		
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10		
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10		
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10		
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10		
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance**

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	19

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

<b>Comments:</b>
------------------

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	N/A	286	19	56	C	
2	N/A	286	19	56	C	
3	N/A	286	19	56	C	
4	N/A	286	19	56	C	
<b>Comments:</b>						

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.

Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development

District and school improvement plans and professional development services were differentiated to meet the unique needs of urban, suburban and rural areas. High-quality and sustained professional development was delivered by service cooperatives based on regional need assessments. The services were customized to meet the needs of eligible AYP districts and schools, especially Corrective Action and Restructuring schools. Professional development funded through NCLB programs reflected the statutory set of principles from Section 9101 (34) of NCLB.

AYP regional Coordinators delivered customized technical assistance and high quality professional development in many areas like tailored data retreats, classroom walkthrough trainings, quality indicator assessments, formative assessment trainings, professional learning communities and leadership networking of teachers (in such areas as working with children with special needs, students of poverty, ELL) etc. The outcomes of the professional development areas were intended to close the gap of professional development needed by districts/schools not making AYP. Institutions of higher learning were also networking with regional service cooperatives on some of these initiatives as well. All of these components fit together in support of the SSOS when coupled with leadership of MDE.

Utilize research-based strategies or practices

In accordance with NCLB, technical assistance and high quality professional development provided by MDE and the service cooperatives was research-based. Simply working harder, adding on test preparation activities, or increasing the number of different teaching strategies is not adequate to prepare students to meet high standards. Research-based practices included using multiple sources of disaggregated student performance data, including state and local assessments, analysis of student work, and teacher observation to determine the learning needs for students as well as teachers.

By establishing professional learning communities, (job-embedded professional development), educators deepened content knowledge and pedagogy to continually improve practice. Teachers who spend more time collectively studying teaching practices were more effective overall at developing higher-order thinking skills and meeting the needs of diverse learners. Coordinated and aligned curriculum and assessment efforts generated through the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum have informed schools about their work.

Frequent monitoring of a manageable number of SMART improvement goals by teachers and teacher teams, administrators, and students guided the improvement focus. Using formative assessments to develop lessons supported differentiated learning and informed teachers as well as students about identified learning needs. Making decisions from evidence of student learning was the best practice approach for school improvement. Coaching provided follow-up implementation support; without it, few new strategies were implemented and sustained. Schools receiving technical assistance used a combination of these strategies to impact targeted student growth and achievement.

Black and Willam (2007); Danielson, C. (2007); Du Four, R., Eaker, R. & Many, T. (2006); Fullan, M. (2007); Hargreaves, A. (2008); Marzano, R.J. (2007); National Staff Development Council; Schmoker, M. (2006); York-Barr, J.(2004);

Create partnerships among the SEA, LEA, and other entities

MDE, through the regional service delivery model, provided a school or a district that is identified for improvement with extensive support and technical assistance in designing and implementing a plan to improve student achievement. MDE implemented a regional technical assistance framework to better assist the district with their improvement responsibilities. This structure allowed the School Improvement Division to promote leadership and support teams in a way that was efficient and sustainable. Furthermore, the technical assistance framework ensured a consistent system of support for districts (and schools), in accordance with federal expectations. Improvement plans drove the goals, policies, procedures, professional development, and teaching and learning needs for districts and schools In Need of Improvement.

Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of district and school leadership teams

The emphasis in year four of the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) was to support the capacity of AYP districts to initiate and sustain rapid system-wide improvement. Rapid district improvement was defined as substantial changes in district structures, culture, policies and processes within 1-3 years; evidence of significant improvement in instructional practices and student performance within 3-4 years; and evidence that changes and improvements were system-wide and sustainable.

The regional education service delivery model ensured that districts In Need of Improvement had an active leadership team of skillful and experienced individuals charged with assisting their districts and schools (support teams) with effective and helpful assistance to increase opportunities for all students to meet the state's academic content and achievement standards. Teams includes some or all of the following: highly qualified or distinguished teachers and principals, pupil services personnel, parents, representatives of higher education, regional education service centers, and outside consultants.

Technical assistance and professional development areas that were especially beneficial for district leadership teams included reorienting

the organization and shifting culture and beliefs; supporting ongoing collective problem solving around issues related to teaching and learning; analyzing and using data to identify district and school areas of improvement; investigating, identifying and selecting improvement strategies; and benchmarking and evaluating the impact of improvement strategies.

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

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

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

**Comments:** Comments: The SEA reserved 4% of the total Title I, Part A for the purpose of serving schools in accordance with Section 1003(a)

**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.

#### CSPR 6 1.4.8.5.3

##### Evaluation and Technical Assistance Activities Text

The School Improvement Grant (SIG) program evaluation process was designed to measure the effectiveness of the SIG work from 2008 to 2010. It included three components: A) trends in AYP results for the participating schools/districts; B) schools/districts monthly self-report of work completed for SIG within four major components (high quality professional development, job-embedded professional development in the form of professional learning communities, formative assessment, and coaching/mentoring); and C) school's/districts' end of grant self report of the level of implementation of the components. Both quantitative and qualitative data generated from these sources was used to evaluate: 1) changes in schools'/districts' performance on AYP measures before and after participation in SIG; 2) the relationship between the monthly self report of work being done at the school and reported level of implementation at project's end; and 3) the relationship between AYP quantitative results and schools'/districts' self report of implementation of the components. The data has been used for summative evaluation as well as formative evaluation to define next steps for sustaining improvement processes.

The trends in AYP results for the participating schools/districts were built using data from state data bases. It included data on the changes in AYP index rates by content area over time, patterns in 'making'/'not making' AYP, patterns in subgroups 'making'/'not making' AYP and changes in proficiency rates by content area over time. Data analysis looked for relationships between the different changed scores across years and across schools/districts. Although the majority of SIG participating schools/districts were focusing on improvement of one content area, the data analysis also looked at the relationship between the changes across content areas over time. The index rate data for each content area was collapsed into one academic indicator based on whether there was a positive (+), negative (-1), or no change (0) in the index rate from the previous year. The subgroup data for each content area was collapsed into another academic indicator based on whether the number of subgroups identified for 'not making' AYP increased (-1), decreased (+), or stayed the same (0). These latter two scores were combined to give an overall score of academic improvement.

SIG awardees were required to hire a licensed teacher as an instructional coach. MDE provided initial coach training from the state reading and math specialists. MDE also partnered with the Statewide System of Support to create a coaching network in the metro area. The MDE specialist facilitated training about continuous improvement as a school improvement strategy. Learning community overview and ongoing conversations with MDE grant specialists helped to build interpretive capacity about data and learning. The coach submitted a monthly report of work related to the four components of the grant. The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) SIG education specialist reviewed these reports and facilitated monthly conversations with SIG hired coaches about the cause-effect relationships between teaching and learning. The data from these reports was randomly reviewed by MDE and compared to schools'/districts' self report of implementation at the end-of-grant as a means of triangulating qualitative data.

To extend the usefulness of the monthly report format, each SIG licensed teacher was asked to submit a mid-year self evaluation report. It used the same responsibility criteria as the monthly progress report and invited critical reflection about evidence-based strategies or interventions to be sustained or discontinued. Identified needs for student and teacher learning were listed to support the targeted purposes of the grant in the context of new learning.

The Statewide System of Support used the information to guide clear and actionable technical assistance with schools/districts and address teaching practices and learning issues. On-site training to support the work of formative assessment has convinced more SIG awardees that this kind of professional development informs teaching actions that makes a difference in student achievement. Onsite and online training about examining student work has tightened the focus of job embedded professional development.

The third evaluation component involved an end-of-grant self report of the level of implementation. This tool had two parts: part 1 measured implementation of the four major components and part 2 measured the level of collaboration/support the school/district received from their regional partner during the grant period. The self report ratings were analyzed to determine separate ratings of each of the four major SIG components as well as an overall rating of the partnership. This data was triangulated with the monthly reports for each school/district. The analysis also explored relationships across the different components as well as relationships with the change in student performance as measured by the changes in index rates and proficiency rates. The MDE education specialist prepared a training for all AYP coordinators (partners) in the state to examine the evaluative thinking framework in the program evaluation and to see the relationship of the framework to root cause analysis.

The evaluation process provided lessons for consideration about school improvement planning. First, tools such as the self report rating scale for implementation need to be developed prior to work beginning, rather than at the conclusion of the grant period. It is a tool to be disseminated and discussed regularly with school/district leadership staff to develop a common language and expectation in school improvement. Second, schools/districts need experience with data-driven decision-making focused on systemic change, rather than individual student change. Teachers need guidance and technical support to gather, organize, and interpret data across classrooms to determine recursive instructional problems needing attention while learning how to collaboratively identify instructional strategies that will result in systemic change for all students to be implemented as an integral part of their ongoing teaching practices. Third, schools/districts need experience assessing the fidelity of implementation of research-based instructional strategies. If they are expected to implement a comprehensive data-driven decision-making process, part of the work load for partners is to mentor/coach them in planning for collaborative implementation of well-defined research-based instructional strategies as well as the art of measuring and evaluating their implementation.

Remaining unspent funds were redistributed to SIG schools per expectations for supplemental funding as allowed in the original federal grant. Additional monies were awarded on the basis of: (a) timely program progress reporting; (b) timely and successful implementation of grant progress to date; (c) student achievement goal progress. Because there were 3 Rounds of awarded funds, each awarded at different time intervals, supplemental awards were also based on predictive, inferential and descriptive data. These funds maintained the same targeted math and/or reading focus as regular funds and the action plan was completed at the same date as regular SIG funds. Planning for these funds considered the secured commitment of School Improvement Grant recipients, scientifically-based research, and other initial work. Evaluation was designed by the awardees with outcomes and impacts addressing two questions: (a) what changed as a result of this funding? (b) how has this award forwarded sustainability of the site's evid



**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.

Created partnerships among the SEA, LEA, and other entities: MDE, through the regional service delivery model, provides a school or a district that is identified for improvement with extensive support and technical assistance in designing and implementing a plan to improve student achievement. MDE implemented a regional technical assistance framework to better assist the district with their improvement responsibilities (capacity building). This structure allows the School Improvement Division to promote support teams in a way that is efficient and sustainable. Furthermore, the technical assistance framework ensures a consistent system of support for schools and districts, in accordance with federal expectations. Improvement plans drive the goals, policies, procedures, professional development, and teaching and learning needs at the school.

MDE School Improvement Division and other SEA agency staff were also available to directly support schools and districts In Need of Improvement through technical assistance requests. This included, but was not limited to, content, staff development, RtI, PBIS, Title IA, Title IIA and Title III specialists. A "Bibliography of Professional Development Resources" provided follow-up information or resources for these and other areas as well.

On-Demand Professional Development: The School Improvement Division created a variety of web-based videos and tutorials covering many topics for on-demand professional development that have been developed to provide information to schools and districts regarding professional learning communities, teacher observation components, goal development, gifted and talented acceleration, and online staff development reporting. View the On-demand Video Presentations and Tutorials document with links to these resources.

Teacher Mentoring Program Partnerships: To help Minnesota school districts (including In Need of Improvement) envision a system of supports for early career educators and those who are in career transition, a partnership among several Minnesota educational institutions was established in 2006. The Teacher Support Partnership (TSP) currently has representation from Education Minnesota, the Minnesota Department of Education, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, and the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Minnesota - Twin Cities. Members of this partnership believe that all initial educators and educators in transition should have access to comprehensive induction supports that will help them be more effective educators for Minnesota's children.

In collaboration with teams of P-12 teacher leaders and higher education partners from across the state, TSP has developed the Minnesota Educator Induction Guidelines which provide a framework for developing a comprehensive induction system for all educators in Minnesota. Please visit the Teacher Support Partnership Website to view these guidelines. The Minnesota Educator Induction Guidelines provide a framework for developing induction systems for all educators in Minnesota. Professional induction provides professional learning opportunities for developing dispositions and practices that support student learning. The system includes learning opportunities such as orientations to the workplace, a network of peer support, seminars and workshops, and mentoring focused on standards of professional practice and continual professional growth. Induction is a multi-year process of professional learning targeted at significant career transitions. Ultimately, the goals of an induction system are to improve the quality of education for all students by improving the quality of Minnesota's educators.

### 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	97,562
Applied to transfer	1,146
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,067
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,505,267

**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.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	35

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	41,734
Applied for supplemental educational services	35,350
Received supplemental educational services	8,751
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 11,111,666
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	92,438	90,240	97.6	2,198	2.4
All elementary classes	34,860	34,238	98.2	622	1.8
All secondary classes	57,578	56,002	97.3	1,576	2.7

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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
---	---

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because of the way data are collected, Minnesota uses a hybrid method. Since we have no classroom level student data, we must use teacher data and the teacher data are collected in the form of assignments, which can cover more than one class, but not more than one subject. For example, a teacher may teach two classes of Algebra I and have one assignment for Algebra I. Alternately, the same teacher could instead be reported with a separate assignment for each "section" of Algebra I taught.
---

**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.

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	28.9
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	35.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	35.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	11.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	28.6
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	60.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	7,662	7,450	97.2
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	8,188	8,054	98.4
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	8,583	7,797	90.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	22,682	22,384	98.7
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	55.4	25.7
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced lunch counts	
Secondary schools	61.9	25.9
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced lunch counts	

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

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.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	6
Yes	Two-way immersion	2
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	1
Yes	Developmental bilingual	1
Yes	Heritage language	2
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No Response	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	69,095
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	64,454
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	27,923
Hmong	15,762
Somali	9,119
Vietnamese	1,994
Burmese	1,295

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	58,525
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,931
Total	63,456
<b>Comments:</b> The business rules used for LEP changed to be consistent that only LEP students who have taken all three tests are counted in the proficiency calculations.	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	5,526
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	9.4
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	55,635
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,327
Total	59,962
<b>Comments:</b> 1.6.3.2.2 Title III assessments contain students who received all 3 LEP assessments. If they received only 1, they weren't counted. Title III students served contains any Title III student from any time during the school year, not just over the assessment window.	
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).	
	<b>#</b>
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.	11,311

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	<b>Results</b>		<b>Targets</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	41,468	93.6	34,315	71.00
Attained proficiency	5,011	9.0	5,368	9.00
<b>Comments:</b> 1.6.3.2.2 Title III assessments contain students who received all 3 LEP assessments. If they received only 1, they weren't counted. Title III students served contains any Title III student from any time during the school year, not just over the assessment window.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

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

**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)
<b>Comments:</b>



**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
8,014	5,393	13,407
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,436	4,272	57.5	3,164
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,037	4,578	65.1	2,459
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,972	777	26.1	2,195
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	94
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	14
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	61
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	32
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	3
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	15
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	19
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	29
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	31

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:**

**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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

**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:**

- 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.
- 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).
- 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
11,303		4

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.

There was an error in this data collection which MDE has addressed but could not make the necessary changes in EDEN in time to meet the reporting deadline. The correct # of Immigrant Students Enrolled is 16,108 and the correct # of Students in 3114 (d)(1) Program is 1047.

**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.	1,210
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	186

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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	64	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	46	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	46	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	38	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	
Other (Explain in comment box)	10	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	59	4,933
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	61	1,323
PD provided to principals	51	259
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	43	204
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	42	994
PD provided to community based organization personnel	11	323
<b>Total</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>8,036</b>

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
7/02/09	10/30/09	90
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

MDE is in the process of streamlining all grant applications and approval procedures.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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	91.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	76.6
Hispanic	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	94.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	85.1
Limited English proficient	62.6
Economically disadvantaged	82.9
Migratory students	
Male	90.5
Female	92.8
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

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

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.1
Hispanic	3.1
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	<3
Limited English proficient	<3
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	<3
Male	<3
Female	<3
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

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

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

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

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

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	434	165
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	444	175
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	44	187
K	234	657
1	212	545
2	223	464
3	210	503
4	198	420
5	193	428
6	167	371
7	159	388
8	167	427
9	233	402
10	219	451
11	231	417
12	428	643
Ungraded		
Total	2,918	6,303

**Comments:** The totals of 1.9.1.1 and 1.9.1.2 match for students enrolled in grades K-12 (2874 and 6116 respectively). Minnesota does not have primary nighttime residence data for students aged 3-5.

**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	1,053	2,892
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,480	2,757
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	70	57
Hotels/Motels	287	410
Total	2,890	6,116

**Comments:** The totals of 1.9.1.1 and 1.9.1.2 match for students enrolled in grades K-12 (2874 and 6116 respectively). Minnesota does not have primary nighttime residence data for students aged 3-5.

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,348
K	713
1	645
2	596
3	614
4	529
5	520
6	457
7	470
8	519
9	481
10	527
11	493
12	848
Ungraded	
Total	8,760
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	334
Migratory children/youth	51
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,744
Limited English proficient students	795
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	9
Expedited evaluations	7
Staff professional development and awareness	10
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	9
Transportation	9
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	10
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	9
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	9
Coordination between schools and agencies	9
Counseling	7
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	9
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Additional Services: 1) Teacher at a community after-school program, Perspectives, that provides tutoring, homework help and parenting classes for families in a large transitional housing complex; 2) Computer laptops, internet connection and tech training and support for high schools to keep up with homework and also allow parents to search for services and employment; 3) Parenting support groups at a transitional housing site; 4) AmeriCorps staff that coordinated fundraising and distributed clothing and hygiene items to The Kids Closet and a shelter.

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

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

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	4
Transportation	7
School records	4
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1) Even though Minnesota reimburses school districts for approximately 80% of excess transportation costs, the logistics of providing transportation are difficult to manage in dense urban areas as well as spread out rural areas. 2) Schools wanted a plan prior to school enrollment to provide safe care for students with complex medical needs - severe seizures, ADHD student needing spec ed. 3) Cultural practices determine whether generational doubled up families consider themselves homeless.

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	343	129
4	297	93
5	318	110
6	255	91
7	271	75
8	266	77
High School	207	57
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment**

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	346	132
4	301	103
5	313	69
6	258	65
7	266	49
8	270	37
High School	208	N<10
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	519
K	203
1	195
2	188
3	160
4	168
5	162
6	141
7	164
8	159
9	137
10	116
11	100
12	64
Ungraded	17
Out-of-school	14
Total	2,507
<b>Comments:</b> q	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease is due to lack of work this summer in some areas of the state due to changes in agricultural work (Round Up Ready Sugarbeet, less need for hand labor), bad weather kept some families away due to lack of work and due to country's economic hardships, some families did not move due to lack of funds.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	310
K	78
1	71
2	67
3	49
4	48
5	51
6	42
7	39
8	37
9	35
10	12
11	21
12	11
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	
Total	
<b>Comments:</b> 1.10.2this is correct, we have no out of school students served in the program during summer session.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease is due to lack of work this summer in some areas of the state due to changes in agricultural work (Round Up Ready Sugarbeet, less need for hand labor), bad weather kept some families away due to lack of work and due to country's economic hardships, some families did not move due to lack of funds.  
Minnesota also had 2 fewer sites that served 3-5 year olds this past summer.

**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.

What system did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and 2 child count?

Minnesota began using the MIS2000 system in January 2000.

Were the child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system?

Yes, Minnesota used the MIS2000 system last year.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

Minnesota Identification & Recruitment process worked cooperatively with Tri-Valley Opportunity Council (TVOC) to recruit potential eligible migrant children ages 6 weeks to age 21 with oversight by Midwest Migrant Educational Resource Center (MMERC). This joint recruitment process allowed TVOC, a Head Start program serving children ages 6 weeks to 5 years old or until they enter Kindergarten and the Title I Migrant Education Program to directly serve students PreK-21.

What data were collected?

The following COE data elements were collected: student information (family surnames): birth date, age, gender, race; parent or guardian (s) legal names, current residence, home base residence, all children's names, relationship to parent or guardian, current grade and school, qualifying activity, qualifying activity date and residence date.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

The local and regional outreach workers conducted personal interviews in the following locations: homes, schools, businesses, labor camp, processing plants, in the fields and farms with potential eligible migrant families to determine eligibility using an original, triplicate paper copy of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Once eligibility was determined the parent/guardian and the recruiter both signed the COE for eligibility verification.

School Year Process- the local Recruiter/school liaison gathered information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. We also had several regional recruiters that identified migrant students in unfunded districts and did outreach to agricultural businesses. The information was reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to the ID & R Manager at TVOC and forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputted the data into MIS2000 system. TVOC runs reports to cross check the data that has been entered. The Quality Control specialist reviews the reports on the MIS2000 system for accuracy.

Summer Process-the regional Statewide Recruiter (Family Service Worker (FSW)/Local Recruiters) gathered information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. The information was reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to the ID & R Manager at TVOC and then forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputted the data into MIS2000 system. TVOC runs reports to cross check the data that has been entered and forwards it the Quality Control specialist to review reports on the MIS2000 system for accuracy.

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

The data was collected continuously and submitted regularly and entered into the MIS2000 database

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.

In order to verify the count and before any of the tables are run, our MIS2000 data entry clerk ran a snap report of the MIS2000 database system called "Potential Duplicate Students". A list was generated that identified all students that had the same first and last name and same date of birth. The students were merged in the system to eliminate any duplication. A second report was run from the Potential Duplicate Student, but using different criteria. A request was made for the same first name OR last name AND same date of birth. This list is much longer. That was a check for any possible misspellings or obvious errors. We verified the COE to see if the students had the same family surname. Sometimes it was discovered that there were two COEs for the same family.

Reports of enrolled children are sent to district data clerks periodically throughout the year to cross check for accuracy of information in the State MARSS database and to ensure that only eligible children have been entered into the migrant database (MIS2000).

Current enrolled reports are run periodically and the Quality Control specialist compares those numbers to district and recruiters reports to ensure all data has been entered accurately and to monitor counts.

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.

**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.

1. students who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were between 3-21 years of age, were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);

2. students who were residents in Minnesota for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/01-8/31);

3. students who in the case of category 2- received MEP funded services during the summer or intersession term; and

4. students once per child count category.

- EnrollDate, FundingDate, QADate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate was between the StartDate and the EndDate entered (check for dates of activity that occur during the date range.)
- FacilityID was between MN and MO (count only enrollments in MN schools
- Birthdate was after the StartDate minus 22 years (The child turns 22 after StartDate.)
- Birthdate was before the EndDate minus 3 years (The child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)
- 22nd Birthday was after the FundingDate (the child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)
- 3rd Birthday was before the WithdrawDate, or the WithdrawDate is null (The child turns 3 before the WithdrawDate or there is no Withdrawdate entered.)
- LQMDate plus 3 years was after the StartDate (LQMDate is within 3 years of the StartDate.)

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.

**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.

All recruiters were required to attend trainings throughout the year that discuss eligibility requirements, accurate completion of the Certificate of Eligibility, receive updates on new regulations or systems like MSIX, train on interviewing skills, hands on exercises with scenarios, agri-businesses connections, and communicate and share ideas with peers. Each training has a pre and post test component to ensure that recruiters have understood the concepts. Minnesota has also instituted a certification process which requires recruiters to successfully pass a test. Those who do not pass receive individual assistance from their regional recruiter until they do pass. Does MN provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)? Yes, recruiters receive the MN Identification and Recruitment manual, plus all recruiters receive a copy of OME Non-Regulatory Guidance. Weekly conference calls are held throughout the year to update regional recruiters. In the summer, all recruiters have a regional conference call to discuss eligibility information and to share pertinent recruiting information with others. The recruiter conducts a personal interview to gather migrant eligibility information on the COE, once eligibility was determined and COE was completed then both the parents and the recruiter verified the data by signing the original COE. Each COE is then reviewed by the TVOC ID&R manager to ensure that eligibility requirements are met and that it is filled out accurately. If the manager discovers that a family is not eligible, the specific recruiter, ID&R oversight coordinator and state department are notified. The ineligible students are taken out of MIS2000 and kept in a separate file. Does MN periodically evaluate the effectiveness of recruitments efforts and revise procedures? Yes, recruitment procedures have been evaluated and adjusted to increase the effectiveness of recruitment efforts. This past year defining the recruitment regions, working with school district staff at funded districts and working closely with MARRS coordinators and state MARRS coordinator have increased the effectiveness of recruitment efforts in Minnesota. Once the COE is filled out by local staff, the project coordinator or site supervisor reviews the COE for accuracy and completeness. The COE is then sent to TVOC IDR Manager, who reviews the COE for completeness and accuracy. If there are any errors or missing information for eligibility determination, TVOC IDR Manager contacts the Migrant Program for clarification and the file is marked pending until information is clarified. If COE is accurate and complete, TVOC IDR Manager signs the COE verifying student eligibility and COE is entered into state Migrant data base.

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.

50 students were randomly selected for re-interview process. Some of the families were contacted via phone or home visit. In cases where a second interview was not attainable (no phone available); other supporting documents were sought. MSIX (see if child was enrolled in another state), MN school district enrollment records and Migrant Head Start supporting documents were viewed to further determine eligibility. Of the 50 students in the randomly selected re-interview, 0 were found ineligible. Was your re-interviewing sample done statewide overall or was it stratified by group/area? The re-interviewing sample was done statewide. Were re-interviewers trained and provided guidance? Yes, re-interviewing was done by TVOC IDR Manager and Regional Recruiters. Were re-interviewers independent from original interviewers? Yes. The TVOC IDR Manager, randomly pulls two COE's per Recruiter to re-interview. Families who were served in the Migrant Head Start program and have paper work that establishes move of residency and work in qualifying agricultural activity will be counted as eligible. Families that were not served in the Migrant Head Start program will be contacted by a Regional Recruiter or the TVOC IDR Manager either by phone or home visit. Each person who has recruited, regional Recruiter/Family Service Worker/Migrant Liaison, will have at least one family contacted in a 2 year cycle.

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.

Minnesota Migrant Education Program weekly ran the "Verify COE data" in the MIS2000 system, which the data entry clerk used to crosscheck the report to ensure that all the required data elements were entered accurately into the system. The data entry clerk sent the batch of COEs to the State Migrant Education Program for filing. Reports of enrolled children are sent to district data clerks periodically throughout the year to cross check for accuracy of information in the State MARSS database and to ensure that only eligible children have been entered into the migrant database (MIS2000). Current enrolled reports are run periodically and the Quality Control specialist compares those numbers to district and recruiters reports to ensure all data has been entered accurately and to monitor counts. Data entry performs periodic audit reports for accuracy. Districts receive a report of students enrolled in the state database, they in turn check report for accuracy and report any discrepancies. IDR Oversight coordinator and IDR Manager also run reports quarterly to check for accuracy. Count by program reports are run four times a year and shared with staff to review and 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.

The final steps taken by the SEA was to upload changes, verify and back up data to ensure that the most accurate data was reported to the Office of Migrant Education. The above mentioned checks were programmed in the MIS2000 system to report only requested reporting elements.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA will be utilizing the Student Linking System to verify that LEAs are only reporting eligible migrant students. This will allow the MEP to ensure correct data entry. Each COE is reviewed by the TVOC IDR manager to ensure that eligibility requirements are met and that it is filled out accurately. If the TVOC IDR manager discovers that a family is not eligible, the specific recruiter, ID&R oversight coordinator and state department are notified. The ineligible students are taken out of MIS2000 and kept in a separate file. If any students are found ineligible during our annual state re-interviewing process, these students will be removed from MIS2000. Results of the re-interview are shared with oversight coordinator, the state department and local districts and recruiters. Districts/recruiters having an ineligible student will be contacted to determine the best way to correct the discrepancy. Increased training has occurred for all staff filling out COE's, especially the need for additional comments for certain conditions such as to join, early move and especially for any type of temporary work. We have also stressed that recruiters only use types of work listed on handout from state or if work isn't listed only with permission from TVOC IDR Manager. We have also strengthened our recruiter assessments and are currently in the process of developing certification process for staff filling out the COE.

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.