

**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**

**MISSISSIPPI**



**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:

- o Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies* o
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs* o
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- o Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- o Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- o Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013~~4~~, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 200~~5~~6, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2009-10 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Mississippi Department of Education		
Address: P. O. Box 771 Jackson, MS 39205		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Debbie Murphy		
Telephone: 601-359-3499		
Fax: 601-359-2587		
e-mail: dmurphy@mde.k12.ms.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Tom Burnham		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 3:40:18 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.

No Changes or revisions are currently planned for Language Arts or Mathematics academic content standards. A revised science framework for academic content standards was approved in July 2008 - and was piloted in 09-10. Alternate Academic Standards (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities) were approved in February 2009 in Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science and were implemented in 08-09.

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.

No changes are expected for assessments or academic achievement standards in reading/language arts or mathematics. New alternate achievement standards were set in July 2009 and approved by the State Board of Education in October 2009 for the Mississippi Alternate Assessment of the Extended Curriculum Frameworks (for students with significant cognitive disabilities).
--

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

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

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

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)</b>
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.0
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	90.0
<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).

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	258,942		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	509		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,302		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	130,774		>97
Hispanic	5,745		>97
White, non-Hispanic	119,587		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,175		>97
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	2,875		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	160,291		>97
Migratory students	576		>97
Male	132,305		>97
Female	126,637		>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	7,476	29.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,439	60.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,638	10.3
Total	25,553	
<b>Comments:</b> Eden file resubmissions will be made during cleanup.		

### 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	260,903		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	499		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,378		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	130,975		>97
Hispanic	5,790		>97
White, non-Hispanic	121,234		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	25,776		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,843		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	159,978		>97
Migratory students	551		>97
Male	132,903		>97
Female	128,000		>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	8,922	35.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,635	54.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,639	10.5
Total	25,196	
<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	108,120		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	189		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,049		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	54,253		>97
Hispanic	2,224		>97
White, non-Hispanic	50,392		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,987	9,585	96.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	951	917	96.4
Economically disadvantaged students	64,379		>97
Migratory students	134	126	94.0
Male	54,588		>97
Female	53,532		>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		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
<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	38,942	22,824	58.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	45	54.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	364	308	84.6
Black, non-Hispanic	19,407	9,024	46.5
Hispanic	1,064	638	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	18,019	12,804	71.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,456	1,719	38.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	715	392	54.8
Economically disadvantaged students	24,999	12,419	49.7
Migratory students	188	57	30.3
Male	20,120	11,423	56.8
Female	18,822	11,401	60.6
<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	38,970	19,178	49.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	36	43.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	364	258	70.9
Black, non-Hispanic	19,426	7,171	36.9
Hispanic	1,063	487	45.8
White, non-Hispanic	18,029	11,222	62.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,463	1,273	28.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	715	273	38.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,014	9,811	39.2
Migratory students	189	49	25.9
Male	20,134	9,013	44.8
Female	18,836	10,165	54.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	39,812	23,530	59.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	39	51.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	360	304	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20,031	9,468	47.3
Hispanic	907	555	61.2
White, non-Hispanic	18,435	13,161	71.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,019	1,402	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	550	299	54.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,411	12,722	50.1
Migratory students	157	57	36.3
Male	20,455	11,560	56.5
Female	19,357	11,970	61.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	39,847	21,129	53.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	30	39.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	360	268	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20,048	8,057	40.2
Hispanic	907	445	49.1
White, non-Hispanic	18,453	12,327	66.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,029	1,132	28.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	550	202	36.7
Economically disadvantaged students	25,435	11,000	43.2
Migratory students	157	52	33.1
Male	20,469	9,943	48.6
Female	19,378	11,186	57.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	37,941	22,215	58.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	62	43	69.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	303	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,827	8,771	46.6
Hispanic	885	565	63.8
White, non-Hispanic	17,809	12,529	70.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,653	1,068	29.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	454	252	55.5
Economically disadvantaged students	23,833	11,748	49.3
Migratory students	30	10	33.3
Male	19,335	10,897	56.4
Female	18,606	11,318	60.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	37,962	19,500	51.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	62	38	61.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	259	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,842	7,239	38.4
Hispanic	883	454	51.4
White, non-Hispanic	17,817	11,506	64.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,659	810	22.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	453	166	36.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,847	9,793	41.1
Migratory students	30	N<10	
Male	19,347	8,928	46.1
Female	18,615	10,572	56.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	37,493	16,917	45.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	28	43.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	346	242	69.9
Black, non-Hispanic	18,594	5,085	27.3
Hispanic	866	370	42.7
White, non-Hispanic	17,617	11,189	63.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,593	961	26.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	441	125	28.3
Economically disadvantaged students	23,562	7,872	33.4
Migratory students	27	N<10	
Male	19,100	9,123	47.8
Female	18,393	7,794	42.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,842	20,524	55.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	52	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	321	258	80.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,406	7,847	42.6
Hispanic	776	471	60.7
White, non-Hispanic	17,260	11,894	68.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,487	803	23.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	313	129	41.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,626	10,439	46.1
Migratory students	42	24	57.1
Male	18,818	9,975	53.0
Female	18,024	10,549	58.5
<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	36,865	19,485	52.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	47	61.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	323	237	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,411	7,222	39.2
Hispanic	776	403	51.9
White, non-Hispanic	17,276	11,574	67.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,490	676	19.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	315	78	24.8
Economically disadvantaged students	22,639	9,522	42.1
Migratory students	42	15	35.7
Male	18,829	9,120	48.4
Female	18,036	10,365	57.5
<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	36,851	22,095	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	56	67.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	305	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,395	8,801	47.8
Hispanic	790	469	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	17,227	12,462	72.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,387	720	21.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	315	133	42.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,286	11,198	50.2
Migratory students	37	19	51.4
Male	18,831	10,665	56.6
Female	18,020	11,430	63.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,907	19,260	52.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	44	53.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	349	263	75.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,416	7,429	40.3
Hispanic	791	393	49.7
White, non-Hispanic	17,265	11,130	64.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,402	520	15.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	313	82	26.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,320	9,290	41.6
Migratory students	37	12	32.4
Male	18,871	8,682	46.0
Female	18,036	10,578	58.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,169	21,615	59.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	44	68.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	320	281	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,041	8,694	48.2
Hispanic	769	513	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,970	12,081	71.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,446	729	21.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	308	145	47.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,479	10,799	50.3
Migratory students	53	27	50.9
Male	18,456	10,171	55.1
Female	17,713	11,444	64.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,210	16,437	45.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	29	45.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	319	231	72.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,057	5,836	32.3
Hispanic	770	326	42.3
White, non-Hispanic	16,995	10,015	58.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,459	362	10.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	309	48	15.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,503	7,384	34.3
Migratory students	54	18	33.3
Male	18,471	7,187	38.9
Female	17,739	9,250	52.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,737	15,403	43.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	31	47.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	318	227	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,812	4,200	23.6
Hispanic	762	340	44.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,774	10,604	63.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,329	589	17.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	307	55	17.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,256	6,362	29.9
Migratory students	51	16	31.4
Male	18,219	8,538	46.9
Female	17,518	6,865	39.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	30,529	20,472	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	61	44	72.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	212	182	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	16,622	9,539	57.4
Hispanic	521	382	73.3
White, non-Hispanic	13,112	10,324	78.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,105	834	26.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	186	118	63.4
Economically disadvantaged students	18,377	11,159	60.7
Migratory students	65	43	66.2
Male	15,140	9,587	63.3
Female	15,389	10,885	70.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	32,463	16,575	51.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	52	24	46.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	295	224	75.9
Black, non-Hispanic	16,807	5,994	35.7
Hispanic	557	319	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	14,749	10,012	67.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,694	222	8.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	155	48	31.0
Economically disadvantaged students	18,054	6,878	38.1
Migratory students	42	19	45.2
Male	15,717	7,244	46.1
Female	16,746	9,331	55.7
<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	33,376	21,746	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	42	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	367	329	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,029	8,179	48.0
Hispanic	553	399	72.2
White, non-Hispanic	15,369	12,796	83.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,663	611	22.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	169	91	53.8
Economically disadvantaged students	18,596	9,890	53.2
Migratory students	48	27	56.2
Male	16,360	10,835	66.2
Female	17,016	10,911	64.1
<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	905	693	76.6
Districts	152	33	21.7
<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	702	546	77.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	681	526	77.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	21	20	95.2
<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
152	33	21.7
<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	
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
<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)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

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

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the proficiency 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.

---

!Mississippi did not have any districts identified for improvement during the 2009-2010 school year.

---

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

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

<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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
<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	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	8/30/10
---	---------

### 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	25,058	27,594
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	11,739	11,426
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	46.8	41.4
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	25,670	27,304
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	9,233	9,493
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	36.0	34.8
<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	42

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2009-10

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	1, 2, 3, 4, and 5	21	1	12	C	
7 = Combo 2	1, 2, 3, and 4	10	0	4	A	
1		10	0	3	A	
2		8	0	5	A	
7 = Combo 2	1 and 2	6	2	2	A	
8 = Combo 3	1, 2, and 4	5	2	3	A	
5		5	2	3	C	
<b>Comments:</b>						

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

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



**1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Annually, as a part of the school improvement process, staff employed by both districts and schools identified as in need of improvement are required to attend a School Improvement Symposium hosted by the Mississippi Department of Education. During this symposium, technical assistance is provided on the requirements outlined in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Topics discussed include the school improvement planning process, Public School Choice, Transportation, Supplemental Educational Services, Fiscal Requirements, Response To Intervention (Rti), MS Curriculum Frameworks (Math, Reading/Language Arts, Science, & History), Parental Involvement, Data Analysis, School Health, Special Education Requirements, Dropout Prevention and Assessment. As a part of this symposium, effective strategies implemented by schools that have shown a proven record of effectiveness are shared. Also, district staff are afforded the opportunity to collaborate among themselves and share successful strategies that have been implemented in their schools and districts.

**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.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) provides a Statewide System of Support. Under this system, schools identified for school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring planning, a total of 78 for the 2009-2010 school year, were offered on-site expert technical assistance through the School Support Team program. Members of the school support teams were selected by the state from a pool of MDE service providers, which consists of lead teachers/teachers, principals, and administrators that were trained in developing, implementing, and monitoring the school improvement plan and process. MDE staff and the external consultants provided support for School Improvement Teams assigned to each of the LEAs with schools identified for improvement. External consultants provided targeted training identified by the MDE for the School Support Teams (SST) and the MDE monitored the implementation of the training in identified schools. Teams were deployed to schools based upon their area(s) of expertise and the identified needs of schools.

In addition, the MDE provided technical in the form of a week-long symposium, one-on-one work sessions, and on-site visits for over-all school improvement as well as the development and completion of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) application.

**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.

---

No additional actions were taken by the state of Mississippi utilizing funds outside of the realm of Sections 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*.

### 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	39,804
Applied to transfer	286
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	246
<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	\$ 167,793

**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	28

**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	21,061
Applied for supplemental educational services	4,025
Received supplemental educational services	3,405
<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	\$ 3,976,189
<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	131,816	123,960	94.0	7,856	6.0
All elementary classes	94,354	89,531	94.9	4,823	5.1
All secondary classes	37,462	34,429	91.9	3,033	8.1

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
---	---

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All course/class Counts are based on course codes, NCLB core area flags, and instructional periods appearing on each teacher's daily schedules.
---

**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	3.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	24.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	35.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	38.0
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)	28.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	70.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	1.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Currently, Mississippi has a shortage of teachers in geographical areas and certain subject areas. Many of our districts in rural areas have trouble finding and keeping highly qualified core subject teachers. The state is not producing enough teachers to keep up with the demand. The Mississippi Teacher Center is working with those districts to shore up their recruitment efforts and to provide resources and technical assistance as needed.

### 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	18,808	16,662	88.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	25,796	25,394	98.4
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	4,998	4,268	85.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	15,059	14,393	95.6
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

**1.5.3.1** In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high and low-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	90.0	51.0
Poverty metric used	SLB Free Lunch Participation.	
Secondary schools	87.0	47.0
Poverty metric used	SLB Free Lunch Participation.	

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

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts used the Push-In Extended School Year Enrichment Program.

**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 Title III language instruction educational program <sup>a</sup>
- 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	6,084
<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.	4,718
<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	4,969
Vietnamese	376
Arabic	219
Chinese	171
Gujarati	66

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	5,828
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Total	5,828
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,679
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	46.0
<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	4,591
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Total	4,591
<b>Comments:</b> This will be corrected in EDEN file submission.	
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.	1,299

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	1,831	55.6		
Attained proficiency	2,209	48.1		
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

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

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b>



**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
153	336	489
<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
320	258	80.6	62
<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
340	213	62.6	127
<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
27	23	85.2	4
<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	32
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	32
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	32
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	32
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Mississippi is currently not able to report the information on AMAO 1 since 2009-2010 was the first year of its use of the WiDA assessment. No value is reported for AMAO 1 since no value was calculated. Calculation of AMAO 1 will begin with the 2010-2011 data. When entering the data for AMAOs, participants in a consortium were included individually. (That is, there are 32 subgrantees listed, 29 of which were individual grantees and 3 were members of a single consortium) The state has only recently approved its revised ELL Guidelines and has recently submitted its setting benchmarks for attaining proficiency to ED for approval. Results are calculated considering the benchmarks approved approved.

**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	No Response
<b>Comments:</b> Mississippi is currently not able to report the information on AMAOs other than the number of subgrantees, and the number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3. When entering the data for AMAOs, participants in a consortium were included individually. (That is, there are 32 subgrantees listed, 29 of which were individual grantees and 3 were members of a single consortium) The state has only recently approved its revised ELL Guidelines and is currently setting AMAO benchmarks for attaining proficiency and showing progress. The state will have determined and approved those benchmarks prior to the cleanup window for part 1 of the CSPR. During the CSPR Part I cleanup window, all other values relating to AMAO determinations will be entered and verified.	

**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?	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
1,023	347	8

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	108
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*.	154

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	22	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	23	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	17	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	13	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	18	
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	19	2,721
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	21	171
PD provided to principals	20	302
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	17	127
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	7	203
PD provided to community based organization personnel	6	277
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,801</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts participated in national, regional and state conferences/trainings on various topics including WIDA and TESOL.
--

**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.

<b>Date State Received Allocation</b>	<b>Date Funds Available to Subgrantees</b>	<b># of Days/\$\$ Distribution</b>
7/9/10	10/22/10	109
<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.

The State of Mississippi will start the ELL application review process according to the established time line listed below.

All ELL applications will be received on or before June 30 annually.

Applications will be processed/approved on or before July 30 annually; thus making funds available to all eligible LEAs on or before August 1.

**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:**

## 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	86.7
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	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3.0
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	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

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

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

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

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

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	114	114
LEAs with subgrants	38	38
Total	152	152
<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<10	19
K	43	124
1	186	618
2	139	583
3	140	678
4	125	516
5	128	539
6	123	474
7	87	453
8	82	433
9	71	467
10	69	387
11	49	289
12	75	424
Ungraded	23	152
Total	1,343	6,156
<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	46	457
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,245	5,393
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	29	242
Hotels/Motels	23	64
Total	1,343	6,156
<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)	19
K	124
1	618
2	583
3	678
4	516
5	539
6	474
7	453
8	433
9	467
10	387
11	289
12	424
Ungraded	152
Total	6,156
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	109
Migratory children/youth	31
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	899
Limited English proficient students	
<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	34
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	32
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	24
Transportation	22
Early childhood programs	14
Assistance with participation in school programs	22
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	28
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	20
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	27
Coordination between schools and agencies	29
Counseling	30
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	33
School supplies	36
Referral to other programs and services	28
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
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	13
School Selection	3
Transportation	3
School records	15
Immunizations	9
Other medical records	5
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	538	200
4	525	222
5	466	190
6	437	198
7	421	190
8	404	134
High School	275	99
<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	538	256
4	525	255
5	466	236
6	437	211
7	420	223
8	404	188
High School	300	169
<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)	111
K	62
1	70
2	37
3	37
4	39
5	27
6	25
7	31
8	18
9	22
10	19
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	212
Total	727
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID & R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID & R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID & R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons on specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built a relationship with more farmers in their specific area resulting in a positive relationship that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in their region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for that particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.
8. Overall made improvements to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing their recruitment, networking, servicing of children, and documenting quality and control.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	28
K	17
1	20
2	10
3	13
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	11
7	15
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	93
Total	249

**Comments:** Mississippi experienced some technical difficulties building files 121 and 122. The counts populated to the CSPR from files 121 and 122 are incorrect. In reviewing the data, we discovered the counts that were reported mistakenly.

The correct counts are:

Age/Grade - Count

3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) -28,

Kindergarten - 17,

Grade 1 - 20,

Grade 2 - 10,

Grade 3 - 13,

Grade 4 –

N<10, Grade 5

- N<10, Grade

6 - 11, Grade 7

- 15, Grade 8 -

N<10

, Grade 9 -

N<10

, Grade 10 -

N<10,

Grade 11 -

N<10,

Grade 12 -

N<10,

Ungraded -

N<10,

Out-of-school -93,

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count II Category as a result of strengthening the ID & R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID & R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID & R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons on specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built a relationship with more farmers in their specific area resulting in a positive relationship that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in their region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for that particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.
8. Overall made improvements to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing their recruitment, networking, servicing of children, and documenting quality and control.

How services were put in place for 241 additional children, including OSY, in the same period that they were counted?

To address the growing demand and need for services, Mississippi conducted a comprehensive process to identify areas where capacity should be strengthened. The process included an assessment of student needs, review of programming options, interview of potential staff, review of initial training, and monitoring.

Was there a change in the application for local projects?

There was no change in the applications to local projects. Local projects receive services from the Migrant Education Service Center housed at Mississippi State University. The center serves the entire state of Mississippi, which consists of 152 school districts.

How did the State address the increased numbers with services?

The number of projects and tutors were increased to meet the increased number of students and services needed by the student population. Students identified as priority for services, along with the amount of available funding were considered in the decision making.

**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.

The SEA used MIS2000 to generate this report and child counts from the last reporting period. The SEA's Category 1 and Category 2 child counts were generated using the same system, MIS2000.

How did the State correct the issues that they had with reporting areas (in the prior year)?

The SEA has developed a federal programs data division which has strengthened its capacity for the collection and reporting of all federal data. The division is continuously working to ensure that all data is an accurate representation of the MEP and all other federally funded programs.

**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.

The child count data was collected using information from COEs, and school records and/or data. The data elements collected were: names, ages, dates of birth, grades, family information, and addresses. Additional information included family history of migrant lifestyle, and the kind(s) of work performed. In order to collect the data families, school personnel, and other stakeholders were interviewed. The data is collected upon identification and recruitment of the students and their families. After data is collected by the migrant education service center, all information is input into MIS2000. The SEA/LEAs Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts are generated using MIS2000 in the same manner as previous years; the Mississippi Migrant Education Program has used MIS2000 for over 15 years as the MEP's database.

In what ways were the families interviewed for COEs?

Families were interviewed by recruiters at their homes, jobs, community centers, after church services and at parent meetings. Recruiters make every effort to interview families at times and locations that are convenient/comfortable for the family.

Please identify the name and location of the Migrant Education Service Center.

The Migrant Education Service Center is located at

Mississippi State University  
Center for Educational Partnerships  
104 North Jackson Street  
Starkville, MS 39759  
662-325-1815

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 Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center receives funding from the SEA to provide services to children in all of Mississippi's 152 school districts. Migrant children and families are served by center personnel, contractual personnel and statewide recruiter/advocates. The service center's data coordinator with assistance from student workers inputs all COEs and relative migrant data into MIS2000. The service center uploads data on a weekly basis to the state server. The data is uploaded to the state server which is housed at the SEA/Mississippi Department of Education. The State Director reports all migrant demographics to USDE, OME, State Board of Education, school districts and other entities as requested.

When and how frequently are records updated in Category 1? In Category 2?

Records are updated in MIS2000 (Category 1/Category 2) at the service center on a weekly basis. Those records are uploaded to the SEA's state database twice a month and sometimes weekly. Weekly uploads are necessary when large volumes of COEs are processed.

What prompts updates to records/information obtained in Category 1? Category 2?

Updates to records are performed bi-weekly as outlined in the Center's and SEA's data plan. The records/information is updated for quality control purposes.

Please explain any change to data reporting processes between 2008-2009 child count (which was adjusted upward) and this count that ensured an accurate report. (We discussed four or five items that resulted in the inaccurate count last year and how the State changed the data collection and validation process to ensure a correct report for the 2009-2010 child count).

The Office of Innovative Support created a Division of Data and Reporting during fiscal year 2009. This division was created to ensure that data representing federal programs such as Title I, Part C/Migrant, Homeless, ELL, etc., will be collected, analyzed and reported by trained experts in the field of data and assessment. The Division has grown to a staff of three. The director and staff are responsible for all reporting of data for the newly created Bureau of Federal Programs, formerly Office of Innovative Support. However, there remains room for improvement. Future meetings are planned between MDE, MMESC, and a data consultant; these meetings will focus on managing the CSPR/EDFacts process to make it a year-long process with clearly defined data needs, timeframes, and clear delineation as to who is responsible for each part of the process.

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 2 Count data is collected in the same manner as Category 1 child count. Hence, the Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center receives funding from the SEA to provide services to children in all of Mississippi's 152 school districts. Migrant children and families are served by center personnel, contractual personnel and statewide recruiter/advocates. The service center's data coordinator with assistance from student workers inputs all COEs and relative migrant data into MIS2000. The service center uploads data on a weekly basis to the state server. The data is uploaded to the state server which is housed at the SEA/Mississippi Department of Education. The State Director reports all migrant demographics to USDE, OMF, State Board of Education, school districts and other entities as requested.

**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.

Information for the child count is input into MIS2000 at our migrant education service center. The site inputs demographics from the COEs of those students/families that are determined to be eligible for the MEP by regional recruiters. Below are the criteria used for our Category 1 Report and Category 2 Report. Each report counts the student in the grade assigned to the most recent enrollment meeting the report criteria. The StartDate and EndDate represent the beginning and end of the reporting period, respectively.

**Category 1 Report**

- a. EnrollDate, FundingDate, LQMDate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between StartDate and EndDate (This verifies that the student had activity during the reporting period.)
- b. LQM3Date >= StartDate (This verifies that the student is within 3 years of their LQM at the beginning of the reporting period.)
- c. DomID = MS (This verifies that the school history line is a MS enrollment.)
- d. TwentySecondBday >= StartDate and ThirdBday <= EndDate (This verifies that the student is between the ages of 3 and 21 during the reporting period.)

**Category 2 Report**

- a. EnrollDate, FundingDate, LQMDate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between StartDate and EndDate (This verifies that the student had activity during the reporting period.)
- b. DomID = MS (This verifies that the school history line is a MS enrollment.)
- c. Type = S or Type = I (This verifies that the enrollment type is Summer or Intersession.)
- d. Twentysecondbday >= StartDate and Thirdbday <= EndDate (This verifies that the student is between the ages of 3 and 21 during the reporting period.)
- e. Twentysecondbday >= FundingDate (This verifies that the student turns 22 after their FundingDate.)
- f. LQM3Date >= StartDate (This verifies that the student is within 3 years of their LQM at the beginning of the reporting period.)

What procedures does the state use to eliminate duplication?

The SEA runs an unduplicated count from MIS2000 system. Additionally, the service center cleans/revises files on a daily basis. Duplication and questionable files are flagged in the MSIX national database. The center uses MSIX as another source for quality control and to ensure that all files are clean and accurate.

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 SEA's Category 1 and 2 child counts are generated using the same data criteria which is part of the MIS2000 system.

**1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All children are determined to be migrant and eligible for services via the Migrant Education program before information is input into MIS2000. The information that is input into MIS2000 comes from COEs that are completed on each migrant family. The SEA's COE is standard and contains the following documentation: father/mother's legal name, current male/female guardian's name, current address, all children's names, grades, birthdates, gender, birthplace, date of school enrollment, student number, school district of origin, current school district, qualifying arrival date, residency date, type of move and with whom, type of employment (seasonal/temporary), qualifying activity/employment and person verifying information, i.e., parent, guardian, etc. The COE's information is verified by trained recruiters. All COEs contain the signature of the interviewee, the interviewer/recruiter, the program coordinator (who verifies the content and eligibility of the family). If there is a question regarding eligibility, the COE is forwarded to the state for a final determination. All migrant recruiters are trained and certified by the SEA, ESCORT and national ID & R experts. Recruiters attend formal trainings, workshops and conferences at least three times per year. They are required to maintain copies of ID & R guidelines/eligibility standards and the non-regulatory guidance along with other relative educational/reference material. Recruiters are required to visit schools, attend parent meetings and community activities in order to identify and recruit migrant families. They also do home visits on a regular basis. The SEA meets with service center staff and regional recruiters/personnel monthly at recruiters' meetings, coordinators meetings, technical assistance visits and monitoring/audit visits.

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 Mississippi Migrant Education Program conducted re-interviews October 12 - 22, 2009. The re-interviewers were external and had no Mississippi ties; also, team members were bi-lingual and considered to be experts in ID & R. The team conducted statewide re-interviews from a random sample of more than 200 students/families. The state has used the re-interview defect rate and findings as a strengthening tool which has ultimately increased the quality of our ID & R process. As a result of the lessons learned from the re-interview, the state has implemented the following: 1) more professional development opportunities for ID & R staff, 2) intrastate coordination and/peer training, 3) the purchase and utilization of COE tablets for recruiters, and 4) upgrading the current MIS2000 system and going live with MSIX. The service center under the direction of the SEA has used the final determinations of the re-interviews as a learning tool which has ultimately strengthened quality control and ID & R in Mississippi resulting in increased recruitment and identification of Migrant students/families.

What is the ANNUAL process for reinterviewing (without independent, external re-interviewers)? (E.G., How will the SEA reinterview families in the current year?)

The annual process for re-interviewing in a current year is as follows:

"There are multiple ways of ensuring the accuracy of eligibility determinations made by recruiters. Re-interviewing parents is one of these ways and is also considered a good practice by OME. In Mississippi, this practice may consist of "rolling re-interviews" and "formal re-interviews." Through re-interviews, local districts will systematically corroborate the information provided by the migrant family or child during the interview. While the rolling re-interviews will be conducted in an on-going manner, the formal re-interview will be conducted once every three years, using external, non-district personnel as interviewers. The MMESC will provide districts with specific information and training regarding interview protocols for conducting re-interviews. "

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Identification and Recruitment Manual, pg.57)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA and service center personnel meet monthly to discuss, data, data input and using the MIS2000 system. Training of data personnel is conducted by MSED annually; also, new employees are trained as a part of their orientation and on-the-job training. The service center has a full time data coordinator who constantly updates information, checks for errors and inputs COEs. She and the part-time student workers consult with the ID & R coordinator and school districts to ensure accuracy of information via the SEA's data system MSIS. All data personnel and state personnel have been trained on the use of MSIX, MIS2000 and the SEA's MSIS. The SEA checks data in MIS2000 on a regular basis for accuracy and coordinates with MSED to ensure efficiency and accuracy of data as a part of the overall quality control. The SEA in conjunction with outside ID & R specialists, ESCORT, conducts random audits of files annually; this includes a review of COEs, student records and other relative documentation.

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.

State staff run reports at the state level and check the state report against information that has been input at the state migrant service center. Counts are also checked by MIS2000 personnel for accuracy and to ensure that the proper counts are documented and reported as requested by the USDE in the required format.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The service center, under the direction of the SEA, will use the final determinations of the re-interviews as a learning tool which will ultimately strengthen quality control and ID & R in Mississippi.

What process does the state use to correct COEs?

The state uses a process that is outlined in the ID&R manual to correct COEs when necessary. It is as follows:

Reviewing and Approving COEs - at least two individuals other than the recruiter who originally completed the COE should review the form. COE reviewers must ensure that the form is neat, accurate, and complete. The form must be legible and with limited errors; the information in the form is correct; and the form is fully completed. Also, the information in the COE must be verified in a timely manner. An important part of quality control is the review of the COE. In Mississippi, the COE will be reviewed by different people. All COEs are to be reviewed by the recruitment coordinator, data coordinator and/or center coordinator.

- Recruiter (for accuracy prior to submitting the COE);
- State recruitment coordinator (content, qualifying activities, QAD, and comments);
- Data entry coordinator (MSIS, verification of move, and enrollment and withdrawal dates)
- Migrant coordinator ( all of the above)

If COEs are incorrect they are removed from the MIS2000 system. Upon removal of the incorrect COE from the system, the family is notified. However, the program staff/recruiter works with the family to refer them to services/resources in the community.

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, Identification and Recruitment Manual, p.55)

How does the State review student attendance - participation in summer sessions?

The state director travels to and monitors/reviews all summer programs, one visit unannounced and random and the others are prearranged. The SEA has an official monitoring instrument/protocol that is utilized to review summer and after-school programs. The service center maintains daily attendance for all summer programs along with a list of those students who are officially enrolled in the program. The center provides a proposed list of summer programs, the curriculum to be used, a list of tutors/instructors, and a list of students, program hours and activities to the SEA before programs are approved and implemented.

How does the State resolve local eligibility questions?

Local eligibility questions are resolved in the following manner:

"Occasionally, recruiters and/or districts face eligibility questions for which they have no answer, or may need further clarification from the MMESC. In these instances, the following procedures should be followed:

1. Recruiters should consult with the state ID&R coordinator for answers to eligibility questions and problems that may arise at their regions.
2. Recruiters may contact the MMESC via phone and send an e-mail for assistance in providing answers to recruiters' questions. All written eligibility inquiries must include:
  - a. Detailed explanation of case scenario;
  - b. Summary of all documentation and information gathered;
  - c. Recruiter's actual question on eligibility; and
  - d. Recruiter's thought process and opinion of eligibility.
3. The MMESC will research if those questions require the interpretations of the Federal or State law, regulation, or policy. The MMESC may consult with other states or with ESCORT. The SEA or State ID&R Coordinator will contact OME, as appropriate, in writing for the resolution of questions and interpretations.
4. The MMESC will review the research obtained regarding the question and will provide a response to the recruiter. The information will be shared with all recruiters.

The recruiter will review the final determination from the MMESC. The recruiter informs the family and the district or OSY of the final eligibility decision."

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Identification and Recruitment Manual, pg.55-56)

How did the State ensure a random count?

The state used an external re-interviewing team to conduct its' re-interviews in 2009. The team was chosen and managed by META Associates. The random count was determined as follows by META Associates:

Develop Sampling Plan - "META Associates and its sub-contractors, in coordination with MDE and staff from the Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) at Mississippi State, reviewed multiple sources of information to determine the total number of migrant children residing in the state. Specifically, the number of migrant children identified through the state's student database (MSIS), the state's migrant student database system (MIS2000), and the MMESC's records were reviewed and compared to make a sample determination.

As a result of this triangulated review, it was determined that there were 297 students showing both a record in the MIS200 system and a record of eligibility in the MMESC files. After further reviewing the files, it was determined that there were only 155 COEs completed by the state that were on file. Since the total student population and COEs to be reviewed was relatively low, and due to the experience of the contractors in drawing a sample from a low "n", a determination was made to interview all of the migrant students and their families (the population). Because the population was used, it was not necessary to draw a random sample."

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Re-interview Report, Prepared by META Associates, December 2009, pg. 3)

Please provide the following information:

Number of COEs sampled.

155 COEs were pulled for re-interviews.

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Re-interview Report, Prepared by META Associates, December 2009, pg. 5)

Number of COEs that were not available for interviews.

A total of 61 families/COEs were not interviewed.

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Re-interview Report, Prepared by META Associates, December 2009, pg. 5)

Total number of interviews.

A total of 94 families/COEs were interviewed.

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Re-interview Report, Prepared by META Associates, December 2009, pg. 5)

Number of correct determinations.

A total of 70(71%) of the COEs were found to be eligible, which represents a total of 144 (75%) of the students.

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Re-interview Report, Prepared by META Associates, December 2009, pg. 7)

Ratio of correct determinations to total number of interviews.

Mississippi's correct determinations to total number of interview is listed as follows: ' the accuracy level of interviews in Mississippi was determined. It was found that:

- Seventy determinations were eligible without further information needed (71.4%);
- Four determinations were eligible pending further information (4.1%);
- Seventy-four determinations were eligible (75.5%); and
- Sixteen determinations were not eligible (16.3%).

Finally, the panel indicated that there were eight determinations for which a decision could not be made (8.2%). The panel recommended that, unless additional information was provided and reviewed by an independent panel, these eight determinations will be included in the not eligible category."

(Excerpt from Mississippi Migrant Education Program, 'Re-interview Report, Prepared by META Associates, December 2009, pg. 9.)

When did the State align its COE with the national COE?

The Mississippi COE was revised and aligned with the National COE in 07/2009.

When did the State request that OME review its COE?

The Mississippi COE was revised and aligned with the National COE in 07/2009.

---

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has no questions or concerns about the accuracy of the child counts, or underlying eligibility determinations; all information has been validated by regional and state personnel using the MIS2000 system, MSIS, COEs, parental/guardian interviews, school records and other relative documentation.

Please clarify the number of children the re-interviews represented.

The 94 COEs reviewed represented 193 children. These 94 COEs were reviewed out of a possible 155 sample COEs. This would represent a total of 144 migrant students (not children).

Please tell us why eligibility determinations for four children could not be made before the CSPR Part 1 was submitted in December. Those four determinations were deemed eligible in the revision.

During the re-interviews, four COEs representing eight children were found to need more information to determine eligibility. The information the re-interviewer needed and the way in which the questions were resolved are described below.

- For one COE, two of the children on the COE had different qualifying arrival dates than the other children. The MMESC needed to provide two separate COEs due to the different dates the children moved. A new interview was conducted and two separate COEs were submitted.

- For one COE representing two children, a prior history of moves was needed. The family had COEs on file from residence in a previous site. Copies of the COE from the previous site were obtained and added to the file.

- For one COE representing two children, the "move from" on the COE did not match what the interviewee said during the re-interview. A

supplemental form was completed clarifying that the family misstated the city moved from during there-interview.

- For one COE representing two children, the qualifying activity in there-interview did not match the activity listed on the COE. Documentation was provided showing that that original qualifying activity was correct on the COE, and the discrepancy during the re- interview was due to a change in jobs since the original interview.

Please describe how you conduct ongoing, prospective reinterviews with State recruiters (in the years between independent reinterviews).

Reinterviews are conducted by peer-to-peer method during non-independent years. Under the direction of the service center's ID & R Coordinator, with assistance from expert consultants (ESCORT), recruiters reinterview families in regions other than their own. The state has eight regions, i.e. the recruiters from the Southeast Coast, Southeast, Southwest, Central East, and Central West are ~~part of the team that conducts reinterviews in the Delta, Delta North, Central and the Northeast. This cycle is repeated with various~~ teams comprised of recruiters from outside of the region until all reinterviews are conducted.