

**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**

**MISSOURI**



**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: MO Department of Elementary & Secondary Education		
Address: 205 Jefferson Street Jefferson City MO 65101		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Kim Oligschlaeger		
Telephone: 573-751-3543		
Fax: 573-751-9438		
e-mail: kim.oligschlaeger@dese.mo.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Kim Oligschlaeger		
		Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 12:07:38 PM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

**1.1 STANDARDS AND 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 State has created an alignment analysis between the Common Core State Standards document for English/Language Arts and Mathematics and Missouri's current state standards. A plan is in place to create a new state standards document which will incorporate the CCSS to be in use two years before new federal Common Core assessments become operational.
--

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 has changed its English language proficiency assessment from LAS Links to WIDA ACCESS for ELLs beginning with the 2010-2011 school year. A plan is in place to modify the State's Science Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) for its Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate (MAP-A), as well as its Science MAP-A assessment blueprint.
---

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)	90.0
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	10.0
<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)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	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	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
<b>Comments:</b> ,	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	473,833		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,260		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,489		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	83,527		>97
Hispanic	19,035		>97
White, non-Hispanic	359,002		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	64,559		>97
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	12,902		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	225,166		>97
Migratory students	380		>97
Male	242,196		>97
Female	231,229		>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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,762	30.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	38,766	60.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,801	9.0
Total	64,329	
<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	471,631		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,280		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,261		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	83,026		>97
Hispanic	18,608		>97
White, non-Hispanic	357,971		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	64,819		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,465	11,950	95.9
Economically disadvantaged students	223,742		>97
Migratory students	359		>97
Male	241,030		>97
Female	230,203		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	20,599	31.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	38,275	59.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,761	8.9
Total	64,635	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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	200,677		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,032		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,899		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	34,196		>97
Hispanic	7,304		>97
White, non-Hispanic	154,031		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,136		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,441		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	89,017		>97
Migratory students	147		>97
Male	102,064		>97
Female	98,475		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,625	33.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,073	58.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,294	8.8
Total	25,992	
<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	67,648	32,322	47.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	305	145	47.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,468	931	63.4
Black, non-Hispanic	12,004	3,229	26.9
Hispanic	3,133	1,115	35.6
White, non-Hispanic	50,678	26,877	53.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,043	3,382	33.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,478	725	29.3
Economically disadvantaged students	34,866	12,292	35.3
Migratory students	62	N<30	
Male	34,380	16,497	48.0
Female	33,208	15,800	47.6
<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	67,580	29,671	43.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	304	129	42.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,422	787	55.3
Black, non-Hispanic	12,001	2,867	23.9
Hispanic	3,095	892	28.8
White, non-Hispanic	50,697	24,963	49.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,045	2,767	27.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,368	461	19.5
Economically disadvantaged students	34,829	10,965	31.5
Migratory students	62	N<30	
Male	34,353	13,586	39.5
Female	33,166	16,052	48.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0		
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	68,344	33,573	49.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	291	125	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,416	960	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	12,339	3,475	28.2
Hispanic	3,042	1,145	37.6
White, non-Hispanic	51,191	27,831	54.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,378	3,414	32.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,257	699	31.0
Economically disadvantaged students	34,643	12,751	36.8
Migratory students	54	N<30	
Male	35,231	17,253	49.0
Female	33,048	16,283	49.3

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	68,225	35,271	51.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	290	138	47.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,379	904	65.6
Black, non-Hispanic	12,322	3,832	31.1
Hispanic	2,990	1,122	37.5
White, non-Hispanic	51,180	29,231	57.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,380	3,103	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,138	521	24.4
Economically disadvantaged students	34,571	13,296	38.5
Migratory students	54	N<30	
Male	35,165	16,428	46.7
Female	32,996	18,799	57.0

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

## 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<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	67,463	35,339	52.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	164	51.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,336	965	72.2
Black, non-Hispanic	12,108	3,529	29.1
Hispanic	2,816	1,210	43.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,830	29,434	57.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,860	3,100	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,044	700	34.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33,567	13,001	38.7
Migratory students	58	N<30	
Male	34,697	18,306	52.8
Female	32,714	16,996	52.0

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	67,359	34,873	51.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	159	49.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,295	878	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	12,084	3,670	30.4
Hispanic	2,785	1,124	40.4
White, non-Hispanic	50,824	29,012	57.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,857	2,778	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,947	571	29.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,500	12,757	38.1
Migratory students	58	N<30	
Male	34,655	16,883	48.7
Female	32,654	17,960	55.0

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	67,296	33,160	49.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	319	147	46.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,334	794	59.5
Black, non-Hispanic	12,001	2,395	20.0
Hispanic	2,817	984	34.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,773	28,810	56.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,831	2,848	29.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,039	452	22.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33,447	11,635	34.8
Migratory students	58	N<30	
Male	34,611	17,692	51.1
Female	32,633	15,438	47.3

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	68,162	38,157	56.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	342	167	48.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,302	929	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	12,283	3,922	31.9
Hispanic	2,793	1,228	44.0
White, non-Hispanic	51,384	31,877	62.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,370	2,583	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,860	573	30.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,173	14,101	42.5
Migratory students	65	N<30	
Male	35,051	19,506	55.7
Female	33,053	18,617	56.3
<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	68,107	34,214	50.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	342	156	45.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,271	789	62.1
Black, non-Hispanic	12,278	3,557	29.0
Hispanic	2,773	1,029	37.1
White, non-Hispanic	51,385	28,650	55.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,373	2,003	21.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,791	379	21.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33,146	12,037	36.3
Migratory students	63	N<30	
Male	35,014	15,891	45.4
Female	33,035	18,290	55.4
<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	66,878	36,894	55.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	329	174	52.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,279	909	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	11,749	3,545	30.2
Hispanic	2,555	1,101	43.1
White, non-Hispanic	50,902	31,133	61.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,922	2,292	25.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,643	499	30.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31,508	12,793	40.6
Migratory students	40	N<30	
Male	34,180	18,614	54.5
Female	32,634	18,248	55.9

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	66,811	34,987	52.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	330	163	49.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,239	786	63.4
Black, non-Hispanic	11,749	3,458	29.4
Hispanic	2,531	1,033	40.8
White, non-Hispanic	50,897	29,516	58.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,946	1,797	20.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,570	363	23.1
Economically disadvantaged students	31,484	12,015	38.2
Migratory students	38	N<30	
Male	34,138	15,440	45.2
Female	32,608	19,516	59.9

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

## 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	66,924	34,822	52.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	343	154	44.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,271	908	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	11,457	3,176	27.7
Hispanic	2,313	935	40.4
White, non-Hispanic	51,464	29,615	57.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,698	1,978	22.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,335	380	28.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30,141	11,152	37.0
Migratory students	45	N<30	
Male	34,137	17,692	51.8
Female	32,711	17,096	52.3

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	66,895	35,068	52.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	342	182	53.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,236	787	63.7
Black, non-Hispanic	11,473	3,430	29.9
Hispanic	2,289	916	40.0
White, non-Hispanic	51,479	29,723	57.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,706	1,783	20.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,264	251	19.9
Economically disadvantaged students	30,130	11,310	37.5
Migratory students	45	N<30	
Male	34,112	16,307	47.8
Female	32,707	18,731	57.3

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	66,865	32,371	48.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	343	151	44.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,270	758	59.7
Black, non-Hispanic	11,411	2,218	19.4
Hispanic	2,311	756	32.7
White, non-Hispanic	51,455	28,457	55.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,671	1,806	20.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,331	189	14.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30,085	9,692	32.2
Migratory students	44	N<30	
Male	34,095	17,161	50.3
Female	32,695	15,179	46.4

**Comments:** After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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	67,615	39,014	57.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	318	166	52.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,404	1,019	72.6
Black, non-Hispanic	11,333	3,604	31.8
Hispanic	2,352	1,106	47.0
White, non-Hispanic	52,067	33,071	63.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,058	1,994	28.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,262	429	34.0
Economically disadvantaged students	26,746	11,647	43.5
Migratory students	55	N<30	
Male	34,029	19,804	58.2
Female	33,557	19,208	57.2
<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	65,465	48,060	73.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	342	235	68.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,178	937	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	10,861	5,672	52.2
Hispanic	1,965	1,320	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	51,014	39,841	78.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,328	2,635	36.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	872	439	50.3
Economically disadvantaged students	25,311	15,352	60.7
Migratory students	34	N<30	
Male	32,902	22,611	68.7
Female	32,544	25,447	78.2
<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	65,975	37,514	56.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	197	53.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,290	883	68.4
Black, non-Hispanic	10,586	2,922	27.6
Hispanic	2,147	880	41.0
White, non-Hispanic	51,499	32,602	63.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,490	1,849	24.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,051	252	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	25,127	10,140	40.4
Migratory students	43	N<30	
Male	33,029	19,425	58.8
Female	32,937	18,088	54.9
<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	2,199	805	36.6
Districts	554	119	21.5
<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	1,181	418	35.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	609	164	26.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	572	254	44.4
<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
553	119	21.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

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

<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	41
Extension of the school year or school day	11
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	8
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	19
Replacement of the principal	11
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	10
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	17
<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)	6
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Takeover the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	14
<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.

Other major restructuring of school governance included: participation in the Turnaround program, restructuring staff in communication arts and mathematics, extended learning opportunities were provided, data analysis was done to identify the areas of poor student performance, monthly and quarterly common assessment and lesson-planning meetings were implemented, ineffective/poor performing faculty was eliminated, and additional high quality professional development was implemented.

In addition, policies, procedures, and systems were implemented, monitored and evaluated according to research-proven best practices for maximum student achievement.

## 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.

LEAs identified for improvement are required to submit an improvement plan within 90 days of receiving the preliminary AYP data from the SEA. The SEA provides the web-based planning application that includes all of the requirements of the improvement plan. The SEA's Federal Instructional Improvement staff and other SEA staff are available for technical assistance during the planning process. Federal Instructional Improvement supervisors approve the plans.

LEAs identified for corrective action update their improvement plans which must be approved by SEA Federal Instructional Improvement staff. The LEA's Title I administrative funds may be withheld unless the Federal Instructional Improvement staff determines that there is fidelity to the implementation of the improvement plan and progress is being made toward improving in the areas that caused the LEA to receive the sanctions.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

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

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	57
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	5
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	9
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	22
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	1
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	1
Restructured the district	8
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)	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	26	5
Schools	114	6
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	11/16/10
---	----------

### 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	82,294	81,373
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	31,654	26,792
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	38.5	32.9
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	81,302	80,811
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	30,580	28,191
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	37.6	34.9
<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	81
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	3

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

**Comments:**

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<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.
6 = Combo 1	A combination of strategies 1-5 were reported. LEAs reported several other strategies using this combination.	144				A, B, C, and D were reported.
7 = Combo 2	A combination of strategies 2-5 were reported. LEAs reported several other strategies using this combination.	31				A, B, C, and D were reported.
<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.

This information was shared through the Title I.A End-Of-Year Report.

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During SY 2009-2010, the SEA used 1003(g) funds for program evaluation and technical assistance. The Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) are located on nine state university campuses and house a variety of programs developed or adopted to improve the performance of schools and LEAs. They also sponsor outside experts who bring new programs to Missouri for dissemination to LEAs and schools. Support and training for every function of LEAs and schools (from administration through the teaching and support staffs) can be arranged. One specific activity of each RPDC is to team with our State's Supervisors of Federal Instructional Improvement and State Area Supervisors of Instruction to provide technical assistance directly to low performing LEAs and schools. They are involved in the planning process and the implementation of the plan, ongoing support and evaluation, and they report progress to the SEA in regard to decisions concerning the accreditation status of the LEAs.

**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.

---

Missouri does not collect this data at this time.

---

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	26,783
Applied to transfer	2,073
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,998
<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	\$ 1,651,927

**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	0

**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	85,382
Applied for supplemental educational services	6,132
Received supplemental educational services	5,280
<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	\$ 7,935,600
<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	228,483	216,440	94.7	12,043	5.3
All elementary classes	74,065	71,483	96.5	2,582	3.5
All secondary classes	154,418	144,957	93.9	9,461	6.1
Missouri has formed a committee to identify course codes and delivery systems to ensure that only core courses are included in the counts above. That process is now complete and we expect that changes will occur from the 09-10 to 10-11 school year. In addition, we are building a system to handle highly qualified teacher requirements. The changes are reflective of the efforts that have been made to ensure that our data reporting is accurate.					

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Missouri counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	14.1
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	11.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	74.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	10.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	19.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	70.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	16,400	15,137	92.3
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	22,838	22,586	98.9
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	21,700	18,415	84.9
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	63,169	61,422	97.2
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	70.2	38.9
Poverty metric used	Missouri used the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program in this calculation.	
Secondary schools	62.6	35.1
Poverty metric used	Missouri used the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program in this calculation.	

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

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Team-Teaching:** In schools where the classroom and instructional approach permit, team-teaching may be a useful way to "mainstream" LEP students and avoid frequent pull-out sessions. This technique may work especially well at the secondary level when the ESOL teacher can also teach the subject matter. Team-teaching incorporates collaboration, joint planning and cross-curricular themes into instructional programs.

**Resource Classrooms:** For various reasons (number of staff, physical facilities, etc.), some school districts have found that strategically placing an ESOL Resource Classroom in a school facilitates student progress. These rooms are probably most effective at middle and high school grades, where students take separate content classes. They can also serve as an actual ESOL classroom for part of the day. At other times, students may drop in to discuss readings, complete tests, work on projects, or do individualized units of coursework.

**Newcomer Centers:** Larger school districts and those with a steady influx of students new to both school and the U.S. have had success with newcomer centers. Depending on need and district resources, a center may serve as a kind of "chamber of commerce" for the school and community. Centers provide a safe and supportive context for students before they move into a regular school. Some districts bring all new students to a single site for assessment and initial English instruction, and may keep them there from six months to a year. Additional classes may be offered that help students adjust culturally, socially and academically.

**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	21,076
<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.	16,659
<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	11,342
Bosnian	1,130
Vietnamese	1,042
Arabic	737
Somali	676

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	19,132
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,944
Total	21,076
<b>Comments:</b> Missouri Department of Education contacted LEAs in determining why LEP students were not tested. Many districts indicated that the students withdrew from the district, students exited LEP, were absent during the testing window, and LEAs indicated students were coded incorrectly. LEAs submitted a corrective action plan to address incorrect coding.	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,914
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13.8
<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	17,392
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,602
Total	18,994
<b>Comments:</b> Missouri Department of Education contacted LEAs in determining why LEP students were not tested. Many districts indicated that the students withdrew from the district, students exited LEP, were absent during the testing window, and LEAs indicated students were coded incorrectly. LEAs submitted a corrective action plan to address incorrect coding.	
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.	7,566

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	4,957	50.4	9,497	50.00
Attained proficiency	2,632	15.1	2,849	15.00
<b>Comments:</b> AMAO 1 (Making Progress) is met when 50% of students in cohort 1 (receiving instruction 3 yrs. or fewer) meet the requirement and 65% of students in cohort 2 (receiving instruction 4 yrs. or more) meet the requirement. AMAO 2 (Attained Proficiency) is met when 15% of students in cohort 1 (who have taken the assessment) have scored 4 in each modality, and 20% of students in cohort 2 (who have taken the assessment) have scored 4 in each modality.				

**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)
na
<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
2,162	1,961	4,123
<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
2,624	1,319	50.3	1,305
<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
2,556	1,141	44.6	1,415
<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
956	346	36.2	610
<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	71
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	5
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	21
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	26
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	17
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	66
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	62
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	62
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	35

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?	<u>      </u> N
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:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
4,341	709	21

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

**Note:** Section 3301(8) û The term “Language instruction educational program” means an instruction course 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.	1,250
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*.	500

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	70	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	67	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	67	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	56	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	62	
Other (Explain in comment box)	20	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	66	8,284
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	70	989
PD provided to principals	58	613
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	56	300
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	51	1,228
PD provided to community based organization personnel	22	551
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>11,965</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title III districts listed various other professional development activities.
---

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

##### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

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

A preliminary Title III allocation went on-line to sub grantees on 5/17/2010. LEAs were able to submit their Title III applications by 7/1/2010.
--

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	

**Comments:** There are no persistently dangerous schools in Missouri.

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	85.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	86.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	74.3
Hispanic	79.6
White, non-Hispanic	88.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	79.2
Limited English proficient	73.5
Economically disadvantaged	81.1
Migratory students	
Male	84.0
Female	86.8

**Comments:** Missouri does not have student level data from the beginning of high school to calculate graduation rate for migrant students.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	7.7
Hispanic	4.8
White, non-Hispanic	3.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5.0
Limited English proficient	5.0
Economically disadvantaged	3.7
Migratory students	<3
Male	4.4
Female	3.4
<b>Comments:</b> After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.	

#### 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 automatically calculated.

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	480	480
LEAs with subgrants	76	76
Total	556	556
<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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<30	175
K	250	1,192
1	204	1,255
2	196	1,084
3	190	1,140
4	154	1,149
5	185	1,058
6	155	1,070
7	149	908
8	123	917
9	157	1,244
10	128	952
11	208	975
12	316	1,096
Ungraded	N<30	N<30
Total	2,439	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	214	1,818
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,011	11,371
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	53	206
Hotels/Motels	161	820
Total	2,439	13,260
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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)	237
K	989
1	1,041
2	910
3	924
4	959
5	900
6	852
7	769
8	764
9	1,086
10	760
11	774
12	837
Ungraded	
Total	11,802
<b>Comments:</b> Missouri does not have any students who are considered ungraded.	

**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	1,382
Migratory children/youth	88
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,722
Limited English proficient students	359
<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	23
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	26
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	28
Transportation	40
Early childhood programs	14
Assistance with participation in school programs	26
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	18
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	18
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	21
Coordination between schools and agencies	26
Counseling	21
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	17
Clothing to meet a school requirement	35
School supplies	42
Referral to other programs and services	25
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	24
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**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	10
School Selection	6
Transportation	21
School records	15
Immunizations	13
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

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

<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	797	197
4	808	237
5	753	210
6	749	190
7	622	162
8	626	166
High School	N<30	N<30
<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	800	219
4	810	209
5	757	201
6	745	220
7	621	167
8	627	141
High School	N<30	N<30
<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)	100
K	100
1	109
2	90
3	106
4	89
5	80
6	79
7	82
8	47
9	75
10	60
11	53
12	49
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	30
Total	1,149

**Comments:** Missouri does not have any students who were considered ungraded.

**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.

After a completion of a recent attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
<p><b>Comments:</b> During SY 08-09 Missouri funded two summer school programs which allowed us to increase our services to Migrant students. In the summer of 2010, our state made cuts to state-funded summer schools and we had no schools that wanted to provide locally or Title I.C. programs for migrant students, therefore we had no Category 2 children.</p>	

**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.

During SY 08-09 Missouri funded two summer school programs which allowed us to increase our services to Migrant students. In the summer of 2010, our state made cuts to state-funded summer schools and we had no schools that wanted to provide locally or Title I.C programs for migrant students, therefore we had no Category 2 children.

**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.

Missouri uses MSSQL 2008 Database Server to compile and generate the total number of students for Category 1. The category 2 count is collected through a manual paper system. The same systems were used in 08-09 as in 09-10. Missouri did not identify any category 2 children in 09-10.

**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.

Category 1 counts were collected from approved certificates of eligibility (COE). Missouri's COE contain the following data elements: school district name, school district county/district code, school year, enrollment date, child's name, gender, birth date, birth place, type of verification of birth date, grade, school building code, enrollment type, parents' names and contact information, name of person that provided data, residency date, qualifying arrival date, previous residence (city, state, country), current residence (city, state, country), reason for children's move, type of move (e.g., obtain or to seek the following: temporary or seasonal employment or agricultural related or fishing related) and qualifying activity.

The COE is signed by the recruiter and parent. It is then checked and signed by the state migrant director. Regional Recruiting Specialists find and interview families by regularly contacting agri-businesses in their regions, communicating with school district personnel, and visiting the workers in the field. Recruiters will then complete the COE and send to the Missouri Migrant Education/English Language Learning central office. Once the COE has been received, it is screened for accuracy by the Manager of Migrant Data and Quality Control or the state director for final approval.

If questions or concerns arise, the COE is returned to the Recruiting Specialists for follow-up interviews or clarification. Once the COE arrives in the central office, it will be approved and entered into the database within approximately one week from receipt. Missouri's COE was developed using the example COE found in the Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children Non-Regulatory Guidance.

The category 2 count is collected and maintained through a manual paper system. It was collected directly from the Migrant Education summer school funded program. Missouri did not have any funded summer schools in 09-10. This information is then verified to ensure that the child has a COE using the Category 1 database.

The "Migrant Summer School Paper Form" is simply a list of students eligible to participate in a Migrant-funded summer school project. These students each have a completed COE. The required information on the form is the name of the student. State-funded Migrant recruiters complete the COEs and the summer school administrators submit the names to the SEA.

The summer of 2010 was an anomaly where as the state opened the Migrant summer school as a competitive grant program, and no schools applied. That will not be happening again as we will be reverting back to the previous process of the state MEP operating the summer school. Since we had no summer school, we assumed that we could not turn in a Category 2 count and counted all the children identified during the summer as Category 1.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count data is entered by the Manager of Migrant Data and Quality Control. This information is collected from the Certificate of Eligibility. If the child's information needs to be updated, the Manager of Migrant Data and Quality Control will compare the information to the Certificate of Eligibility to ensure the child is the same child and will discuss the update with the area recruiter as needed. The information is updated in the database (including notations in the comment section) indicating the reason for the modification. The information is organized in the student information system alphabetically but can be sorted in any order that is necessary.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 count is collected and maintained through a manual paper system. It was collected directly from the Migrant Education Summer School funded programs. A list of migrant students were sent to the Missouri Migrant Education/English Language Learning central office and to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for verification. They completed a Migrant Summer School paper form with all of the required information, including a list of migrant students that were served during summer school. The list of names was then verified to ensure that the child has a COE using the Category 1 database. Missouri did not have a migrant summer school program in 09-10. The procedures described are used when we do have a migrant summer school program.

The "Migrant Summer School Paper Form" is simply a list of students eligible to participate in a Migrant-funded summer school project. These students each have a completed COE. The required information on the form is the name of the student. State-funded Migrant recruiters complete the COEs and the summer school administrators submit the names to the SEA.

The summer of 2010 was an anomaly where as the state opened the Migrant summer school as a competitive grant program, and no schools applied. That will not be happening again as we will be reverting back to the previous process of the state MEP operating the summer school. Since we had no summer school, we assumed that we could not turn in a Category 2 count and counted all the children identified during the summer as Category 1.

### 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.

Each Category 1 child count was calculated by their age and grade using the MSSQL 2008 Database Server. The Category 1 child count data was entered into the MSSQL 2008 Database Server from each child's Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE's were verified by the recruiter, manager of migrant data and quality control, and state migrant director.

Category 1 edit functions were created using the following criteria: filter out those whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) + 3 years is after 9/1/09 and then filters students by grade and age in using the time frame of 9/1/09 to 8/31/10.

Only children who met the program eligibility criteria are entered into the database.

In the case of category 2, children who received a migrant education program funded service during the summer, these children were identified and double-checked using the MSSQL 2008 Database Server. Children were not duplicated.

The summer of 2010 was an anomaly where as the state opened the Migrant summer school as a competitive grant program, and no schools applied. That will not be happening again as we will be reverting back to the previous process of the state MEP operating the summer school. Since we had no summer school, we assumed that we could not turn in a Category 2 count and counted all the children identified during the summer as Category 1. Missouri did not have any category 2 children in 09-10. Described above is the process that is used when we do have category 2 children.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 count is collected and maintained through a manual paper system. It was collected directly from the Migrant Education Summer School funded programs. A list of migrant students were sent to the Missouri Migrant Education/English Language Learning central office and to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for verification. They completed a Migrant Summer School paper form with all of the required information, including a list of migrant students that were served during summer school. The list of names was then verified to ensure that the child has a COE using the Category 1 database. Missouri did not have category 2 children in 09-10. Described is the process that is used when we do have category 2 children.

#### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each migrant child is identified by the recruiter. The recruiter determines through a series of questions their migrant status. The recruiter will then enroll qualified migrant families on a certificate of eligibility (COE) and distribute copies. The original COE is sent to the Missouri Migrant Education/English Language Learning central office. It is date stamped upon arrival, initialed, and is dated when entered into our data system. One copy is returned to the recruiter and one copy is distributed to the school district of record.

The COE is reviewed prior to data entry to ensure that all boxes are completed correctly and it is also reviewed to ensure that the child meets the definition of migrant. If the COE meets all the necessary criteria it is signed as appropriate. If an item needs clarification the original recruiter who conducted the interview will be contacted to clarify the issue. If critical information is missing or if information conflicts with previous information on file the COE will be referred back to the original recruiter to correct the COE or complete a new COE.

New Identification and Recruitment Specialists receive training from either the State Migrant Director or the state ID & R Coordinator on the ID & R handbook and how to properly identify migrant children. They are then assigned a veteran recruiter to mentor them in the field until they are comfortable enough to go out on their own.

Each school district is required by the SEA to fill out a parent survey form on each child that registers. Completed forms must be forwarded to the recruiter in that region in a timely manner. From the questions on this form the recruiter can determine whether this family can be considered for the MEP. The recruiter will then make contact with the family by phone or a visit and either set a time for an interview or, if possible, conduct an on-the-spot interview if the family was at home. The recruiter determines migrant status through a series of questions. If they are believed to be eligible for the MEP the recruiter will enroll the qualified family on a National Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The original COE is then sent to the Missouri Migrant Education and English Language Learning Central Office. Upon arrival the COE is date stamped, at this time the ID & R Coordinator reviews the COE for accuracy, the child must first meet the definition of a migrant child and all the federal regulations. All of the boxes on the COE must be completed. If the COE meets all the necessary criteria it is signed by the State Director as accurate. If an item needs clarification the original recruiter who conducted the interview is contacted to clarify the issue. If critical information is missing the COE will be returned to the recruiter to correct or complete a new COE and entered into a log as returned. It is expected back into the central office within 7 days of receipt at the recruiter's office.

Then the ID & R Coordinator will look the children up in the Missouri Migrant data system and MSIX to see if the children previously existed in either system. If the children previously existed in the Missouri system the existing COE is pulled and attached to the new COE, and the State ID number is noted on the new COE, if the children existed in MSIX the MSIX number is noted on the COE. If there is a conflict with the new COE and previous information on a past COE the recruiter is contacted to clarify the information. Once the COE is correct it is entered into the Missouri Migrant data system, the original copy stays in the central office, the yellow copy is sent to the recruiter, the pink copy is sent to the school district and the gold copy is sent to the family. ID & R is monitored and evaluated through the re-interview process.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Missouri Migrant Education and English Language Learning central office and regional recruiters determine the accuracy of recruitment by conducting a quarterly random sample of families by telephone. During the months of February, May, August, and November, 30 COE's are randomly selected from the previous two months. A recruiter that was not involved in the initial certification follows up on the COE's by telephone or in person, when necessary, to validate the information on the original COE. The recruiter must complete 10 interviews out of this sample and report the results to the Missouri Migrant Education and English Language Learning central office within 60 days of receiving the COE's. Any discrepancies are resolved with all staff involved. Adjustments are made and records of each re-interview are kept on file. Children who are found ineligible are removed from the MEP. The LEA is immediately notified that the child is no longer eligible for the MEP. Recruiters and the central office work with LEA's to maintain ongoing communication with migrant families and to notify families of students deemed ineligible for the MEP.

In the 2009-2010 school year 17 families were re-interviewed and one family was found to be ineligible. The family was declared ineligible because they refused to be re-interviewed.

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.

COEs are reviewed by a minimum of two people who check for completion and accuracy. The COEs are standard forms and are used statewide in Missouri. The information gathered on the COE is based upon interviews conducted by the recruiters. All students are manually checked for duplication. The database is searched by student name and date of birth. If any of this data appears to be duplicated, the child is counted only once. The information in question is subsequently researched and verified and appropriate adjustments are made.

Staff then verifies that the data are inputted correctly. After a COE has been put into the database, the information is verified by the state director that there were no errors made during the data input stage.

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.

At the beginning of each school year recertification is done to verify the location of each active migrant student. For SY08-09 a list of eligible category 1 migrant students from our migrant database was cross checked to that of our student information system and letters were sent to each LEA to verify the location of each active student. Category 2 students are verified to ensure the child has an eligible COE by using our Category 1 database.

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.

As part of the training process findings are reported and discussed with the recruiters. Training is delivered quarterly to recruiters on the issues found through the re-interview process and written guidance has been developed and distributed to improve the data collection process.

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.

n/a