

**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**

**NEBRASKA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

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

## **PART I**

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

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, 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 2005-06, 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: Nebraska		
Address: PO Box 94987 Lincoln, NE		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Diane Stuehmer, M.Ed.		
Telephone: 402-471-1740		
Fax: 402-471-0117		
e-mail: <a href="mailto:diane.stuehmer@nebraska.gov">diane.stuehmer@nebraska.gov</a>		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Roger Breed		
		Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 1:57:28 PM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT****STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The State Board of Education is responsible for development of a plan to review and update standards for each subject area every five years. Legislation requires that the State Board will review and update the standards in reading by July 2009, the standards in mathematics by 2010, and the standards in all other subject areas by July 1, 2013. In accordance with the timelines adopted by the State Board, but not later than one year following the adoption or modification of state standards, each school district shall adopt measurable quality academic content standards in the subject areas of reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social science. Specifically, Nebraska's Rule 10 says that "No later than December 11, 2009 school districts adopt new academic standards in the subject areas of reading and writing (language arts) determined by each district to be measurable quality standards that are the same as, equal to, or more rigorous than the state academic content standards..." Districts, then, will need to plan for their local boards of education to either adopt the state reading standards or their own local reading standards that equal or exceed the rigor of the state standards no later than December 11, 2009. If districts do maintain their own local reading standards, the student results on local standards may not be used for state reporting. No NDE approval is required for local standards. Reading standards will be measured by the NeSA-R results. The other subject areas will need to be adopted by local boards of education within one year following adoption and by the State Board of Education.

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.

Nebraska State Accountability - NeSA includes all state tests; therefore, the scoring rules, accommodations, security policies, and ethics codes apply to the following:  
 NeSA-R (Reading)  
 NeSA-W (Writing)  
 NeSA-M (Mathematics)  
 NeSA-S (Science)  
 NeSA-AA (Alternate Assessments)  
 ELDA (English Language Development Assessment)  
 All protocols, practices, and procedures for state testing will apply to each test inside the Nebraska State Accountability System, NeSA. As required in the amended Quality Education Accountability Act, 79-760, the Nebraska Department of Education has been building new state tests for the purposes of comparative accountability with the help of their partners, Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) out of Maple Grove, Minnesota, and Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) from the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas.  
 The first operational state test in reading, NeSA-R was administered in the spring of 2010.  
 NeSA Math was field tested in spring 2010 with full implementation in spring 2011.  
 NeSa Science will be field tested in spring 2011 with full implementation in spring 2012.

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

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

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	80.0
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	20.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	146,329		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,543		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,307		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	11,454		>97
Hispanic	21,006		>97
White, non-Hispanic	108,019		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,708		>97
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	8,469		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	62,517		>97
Migratory students	956		>97
Male	74,912		>97
Female	71,417		>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	12,666	56.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,048	35.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,735	7.7
Total	22,449	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	147,349		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,625		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,227		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	11,490		>97
Hispanic	21,092		>97
White, non-Hispanic	108,915		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,867		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,242		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	62,868		>97
Migratory students	954		>97
Male	75,470		>97
Female	71,879		>97

**Comments:** Performance counts include only students enrolled a full academic year. Participation counts include all students enrolled during the testing window.

### 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	12,904	56.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,987	35.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,929	8.5
Total	22,820	

**Comments:** Performance counts include only students enrolled a full academic year. Participation counts include all students enrolled during the testing window.

### 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	77,900		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,273		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,064	1,950	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6,055	5,802	95.8
Hispanic	9,876	9,461	95.8
White, non-Hispanic	58,632		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,665	11,020	94.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,587	3,129	87.2
Economically disadvantaged students	31,052	29,878	96.2
Migratory students	395	378	95.7
Male	39,744		>97
Female	38,156		>97
<b>Comments:</b> Performance does not equal participation because data is based on students enrolled the last day of school. Performance data is based on students enrolled a full academic year.			

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	5,998	54.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,627	32.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,395	12.7
Total	11,020	
<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	21,652	20,521	94.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	432	390	90.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	510	475	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,827	1,630	89.2
Hispanic	3,441	3,156	91.7
White, non-Hispanic	15,442	14,870	96.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,771	3,256	86.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,987	1,778	89.5
Economically disadvantaged students	10,052	9,232	91.8
Migratory students	174	154	88.5
Male	11,085	10,482	94.6
Female	10,567	10,039	95.0
<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	21,818	14,740	67.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	446	175	39.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	490	345	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,826	873	47.8
Hispanic	3,459	1,709	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	15,597	11,638	74.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,817	1,748	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,942	748	38.5
Economically disadvantaged students	10,132	5,385	53.1
Migratory students	171	61	35.7
Male	11,177	7,216	64.6
Female	10,641	7,524	70.7
<b>Comments:</b> Prior to 2009-10 Nebraska implemented locally developed assessments. Beginning with 2009-10, a new statewide reading test was utilized in all districts. The change had a great impact on student performance on the assessment. DStuehmer			

## 1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	2,759	2,399	87.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	40	31	77.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	134	111	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	289	221	76.5
Hispanic	351	269	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	1,945	1,767	90.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	534	397	74.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	310	217	70.0
Economically disadvantaged students	1,253	983	78.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	1,426	1,242	87.1
Female	1,333	1,157	86.8
<b>Comments:</b> We believe the submitted data is correct. DStuehmer 12.15.2010			

**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	21,406	20,713	96.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	423	393	92.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	497	470	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,767	1,588	89.9
Hispanic	3,333	3,202	96.1
White, non-Hispanic	15,386	15,060	97.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,828	3,435	89.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,742	1,628	93.5
Economically disadvantaged students	9,827	9,326	94.9
Migratory students	165	155	93.9
Male	10,992	10,630	96.7
Female	10,414	10,083	96.8
<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	21,461	14,926	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	424	188	44.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	481	374	77.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,772	861	48.6
Hispanic	3,330	1,742	52.3
White, non-Hispanic	15,454	11,761	76.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,845	1,677	43.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,689	668	39.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9,848	5,515	56.0
Migratory students	164	62	37.8
Male	11,018	7,358	66.8
Female	10,443	7,568	72.5
<b>Comments:</b> Prior to 2009-10 Nebraska implemented locally developed assessments. Beginning with 2009-10, a new statewide reading test was utilized in all districts. The change had a great impact on student performance on the assessment. DStuehmer			

**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	4,456	4,044	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	163	87.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	139	128	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	305	237	77.7
Hispanic	643	565	87.9
White, non-Hispanic	3,183	2,951	92.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	861	668	77.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	339	279	82.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,065	1,780	86.2
Migratory students	38	35	92.1
Male	2,240	2,043	91.2
Female	2,216	2,001	90.3
<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	20,891	19,580	93.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	387	330	85.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	510	483	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,671	1,494	89.4
Hispanic	3,136	2,873	91.6
White, non-Hispanic	15,187	14,400	94.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,420	2,831	82.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,376	1,219	88.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9,412	8,524	90.6
Migratory students	155	124	80.0
Male	10,704	9,961	93.1
Female	10,187	9,619	94.4
<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	21,014	14,173	67.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	398	170	42.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	495	368	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,675	756	45.1
Hispanic	3,157	1,521	48.2
White, non-Hispanic	15,289	11,358	74.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,443	1,331	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,349	382	28.3
Economically disadvantaged students	9,483	5,005	52.8
Migratory students	156	59	37.8
Male	10,778	7,056	65.5
Female	10,236	7,117	69.5
<b>Comments:</b> Prior to 2009-10 Nebraska implemented locally developed assessments. Beginning with 2009-10, a new statewide reading test was utilized in all districts. The change had a great impact on student performance on the assessment. DStuehmer			

**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	18,949	17,354	91.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	269	215	79.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	486	431	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,616	1,243	76.9
Hispanic	2,654	2,291	86.3
White, non-Hispanic	13,924	13,174	94.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,032	2,316	76.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,128	873	77.4
Economically disadvantaged students	8,319	7,135	85.8
Migratory students	114	94	82.5
Male	9,686	8,843	91.3
Female	9,263	8,511	91.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	20,587	18,969	92.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	323	273	84.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	448	411	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,601	1,399	87.4
Hispanic	2,998	2,636	87.9
White, non-Hispanic	15,217	14,250	93.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,291	2,562	77.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,124	933	83.0
Economically disadvantaged students	9,086	7,973	87.8
Migratory students	136	109	80.1
Male	10,596	9,729	91.8
Female	9,991	9,240	92.5
<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	20,766	14,170	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	337	147	43.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	437	320	73.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,609	799	49.7
Hispanic	3,018	1,468	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	15,365	11,436	74.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,340	1,120	33.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,096	314	28.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9,183	4,930	53.7
Migratory students	142	52	36.6
Male	10,696	6,943	64.9
Female	10,070	7,227	71.8
<b>Comments:</b> Prior to 2009-10 Nebraska implemented locally developed assessments. Beginning with 2009-10, a new statewide reading test was utilized in all districts. The change had a great impact on student performance on the assessment. DStuehmer			

## 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	2,755	2,402	87.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	47	35	74.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	92	72	78.3
Black, non-Hispanic	239	181	75.7
Hispanic	320	257	80.3
White, non-Hispanic	2,057	1,857	90.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	584	380	65.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	95	66	69.5
Economically disadvantaged students	1,180	924	78.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	1,388	1,218	87.8
Female	1,367	1,184	86.6
<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	20,501	18,835	91.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	352	290	82.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	453	430	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,626	1,377	84.7
Hispanic	2,937	2,553	86.9
White, non-Hispanic	15,133	14,185	93.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,978	2,278	76.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	918	750	81.7
Economically disadvantaged students	8,845	7,682	86.9
Migratory students	103	83	80.6
Male	10,536	9,630	91.4
Female	9,965	9,205	92.4
<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	20,668	14,281	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	364	161	44.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	447	326	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,630	658	40.4
Hispanic	2,957	1,483	50.2
White, non-Hispanic	15,270	11,653	76.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,046	1,040	34.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	885	256	28.9
Economically disadvantaged students	8,940	4,756	53.2
Migratory students	108	43	39.8
Male	10,619	7,021	66.1
Female	10,049	7,260	72.2
<b>Comments:</b> Prior to 2009-10 Nebraska implemented locally developed assessments. Beginning with 2009-10, a new statewide reading test was utilized in all districts. The change had a great impact on student performance on the assessment. DStuehmer			

## 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	2,822	2,525	89.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	49	39	79.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	103	95	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	285	227	79.6
Hispanic	304	247	81.2
White, non-Hispanic	2,081	1,917	92.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	522	366	70.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	107	84	78.5
Economically disadvantaged students	1,183	967	81.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	1,458	1,289	88.4
Female	1,364	1,236	90.6
<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	20,640	18,938	91.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	342	297	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	454	420	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,593	1,310	82.2
Hispanic	2,845	2,461	86.5
White, non-Hispanic	15,406	14,450	93.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,854	2,124	74.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	790	585	74.1
Economically disadvantaged students	8,438	7,249	85.9
Migratory students	123	87	70.7
Male	10,526	9,573	90.9
Female	10,114	9,365	92.6
<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	20,701	14,591	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	347	171	49.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	449	327	72.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,592	737	46.3
Hispanic	2,833	1,410	49.8
White, non-Hispanic	15,480	11,946	77.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,883	923	32.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	740	189	25.5
Economically disadvantaged students	8,465	4,581	54.1
Migratory students	117	31	26.5
Male	10,570	6,964	65.9
Female	10,131	7,627	75.3
<b>Comments:</b> Prior to 2009-10 Nebraska implemented locally developed assessments. Beginning with 2009-10, a new statewide reading test was utilized in all districts. The change had a great impact on student performance on the assessment. DStuehmer			

**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	20,378	18,513	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	345	286	82.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	424	396	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,559	1,114	71.5
Hispanic	2,759	2,305	83.5
White, non-Hispanic	15,291	14,412	94.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,780	2,014	72.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	670	469	70.0
Economically disadvantaged students	8,275	6,910	83.5
Migratory students	117	76	65.0
Male	10,373	9,357	90.2
Female	10,005	9,156	91.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,045	17,978	89.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	209	78.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	419	381	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,317	1,076	81.7
Hispanic	2,236	1,875	83.9
White, non-Hispanic	15,807	14,437	91.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,307	1,592	69.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	491	356	72.5
Economically disadvantaged students	6,494	5,439	83.8
Migratory students	88	70	79.5
Male	10,133	9,020	89.0
Female	9,912	8,958	90.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,705	14,247	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	295	139	47.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	418	288	68.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,340	580	43.3
Hispanic	2,306	1,114	48.3
White, non-Hispanic	16,346	12,126	74.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,421	718	29.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	527	93	17.6
Economically disadvantaged students	6,687	3,504	52.4
Migratory students	93	35	37.6
Male	10,490	6,798	64.8
Female	10,215	7,449	72.9
<b>Comments:</b> Prior to 2009-10 Nebraska implemented locally developed assessments. Beginning with 2009-10, a new statewide reading test was utilized in all districts. The change had a great impact on student performance on the assessment. DStuehmer			

## 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	24,014	21,185	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	312	233	74.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	572	512	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,509	994	65.9
Hispanic	2,430	1,879	77.3
White, non-Hispanic	19,191	17,567	91.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,707	1,803	66.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	480	298	62.1
Economically disadvantaged students	7,603	5,996	78.9
Migratory students	90	60	66.7
Male	12,208	10,816	88.6
Female	11,806	10,369	87.8
<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	964	715	74.2
Districts	253	174	68.8
<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	512	358	69.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	290	181	62.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	222	177	79.7
<b>Comments:</b> 2009-10 was the first year of implementing a statewide Reading test, NeSA-R. Prior to 2009-10 locally developed STARS assessments were used.			

**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
253	174	68.8
<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 designation: 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	1
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	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

!Funds were not available for any district identified for Needs Improvement. Funds were only available for identified schools. DStuehmer

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

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

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

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	4	2
<b>Comments:</b> Two of the requests were from Title I schools and two were from non Title I schools. The two that were changed were due to inaccurate data that was originally provided.		

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

### 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	3,568	3,537
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	3,281	2,903
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	92.0	82.1
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	3,579	3,534
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	2,222	2,897
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	62.1	82.0
<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	13
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	4

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
<p><b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b></p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</p>	<p><b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b></p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p><b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b></p>	<p><b>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b></p>	<p><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></p>	<p><b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b></p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p><b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b></p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
1	Extended learning time; after school tutoring and summer programs	6	1	4		
6 = Combo 1	Combination of 1 & 2	8	2	3		
7 = Combo 2	Combination of 1 & 3	1	1			
8 = Combo 3	Combination of 1, 2 & 4	3				
8 = Combo 3	Combination of 1, 2, & 5	3	1	2		

**Comments:**

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of 7 of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>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.</p>

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.

NDE Title I staff had ongoing discussions with each identified school's Accountability Compact Team (ACT). This included both face to face conversations and conference calls. NDE Reading and Math specialists were also involved in the conversations. Resource Coordinators were also assigned to each identified school. The RC's were NDE staff that were assigned to specific schools. Their role was to act as a liaison to NDE staff and to provide technical assistance and support to the identified school.

Identified schools were encouraged to use the NDE Continuous Improvement Process Toolkit (available on the NDE website) to provide relevant resources.

**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.

NDE Title I staff had ongoing discussions with each identified school's Accountability Compact Team (ACT). This included both face to face conversations and conference calls. NDE Reading and Math specialists were also involved in the conversations. Resource Coordinators were also assigned to each identified school. The RC's were NDE staff that were assigned to specific schools. Their role was to act as a liaison to NDE staff and to provide technical assistance and support to the identified school.

Identified schools were encouraged to use the NDE Continuous Improvement Process Toolkit (available on the NDE website) to provide relevant resources.

Evaluation included looking at AYP data.

**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.

---

NA

---

### 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	6,928
Applied to transfer	N<10
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	N<10
<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	\$ 11,737

**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	8

**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	1,740
Applied for supplemental educational services	209
Received supplemental educational services	181
<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	\$ 167,079
<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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	79,650	79,286	99.5	364	0.5
All elementary classes	36,804	36,710	99.7	94	0.3
All secondary classes	42,846	42,576	99.4	270	0.6

Now that online reporting is used (effective 2009-10), every teacher submits a report, and all were asked to include all courses they were teaching if using departmentalized instruction. Prior to the 2009-10 reporting year, every elementary-endorsed teacher was counted as one course. 3-14-11 KS

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Full day self contained classrooms are equal to one class.
--

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	29.8
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	58.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	38.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	59.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	8,633	8,627	99.9
Low-Poverty Elementary Schools	10,135	10,115	99.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty Secondary Schools	13,733	13,607	99.1
Low-Poverty Secondary Schools	12,890	12,851	99.7

**1.5.4** In the table below, provide the poverty quartile 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	62.1	30.3
Poverty metric used	Free lunch and reduced lunch)/membership	
Secondary schools	45.0	25.2
Poverty metric used	Free lunch and reduced lunch)/membership	

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

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	20,632
<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.	20,386
<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	16,076
Vietnamese	612
Arabic	560
Karen languages	535
Nilo-Saharan (Other)	434

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	18,400
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	79
Total	18,479

**Comments:** We believe the uploaded data is correct. KS 12-13-10

The count of total LEP students is taken from the October student snapshot from the state's student record system. The English language proficiency assessment is conducted from mid-February to the end of March. Due to student mobility, the total number of students tested differs from the total LEP count as the numbers are from different times during the school year. KS 03-10-11

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	5,410
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	29.3
<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	18,400
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	79
Total	18,479
<b>Comments:</b> The number tested and the total number of students do not match as the counts are from different dates. The total number of students is based on the "official" count as of the last Friday in September. The number tested excludes any student who moved or was reclassified as non-LEP since the official count occurred. NRowch 12.8.2010	
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.	5,240

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	<b>Results</b>		<b>Targets</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	6,876	52.2		
Attained proficiency	5,410	29.4		
<b>Comments:</b> xx				

**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> For the State Reading, Mathematics, and Science tests, districts were allowed to administer assessments in the native language during the 2009-2010 school year. However, the state did not provide such translations. For the 2009-2010 school year, the state will be providing native language assessments for Spanish and Mathematics in Spanish only. NRowch 12.8.2010	

**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
1,766	1,624	3,390
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,730	2,474	90.6	256
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,711	1,290	47.6	1,421
<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
1,105	922	83.4	183
<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	22
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	7
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	12
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	22
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	10
# - 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)	4
# - 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:** Each consortium is listed as one subgrantee, regardless of the number of districts. In Nebraska, there were 16 districts that qualified as a single grantee (having more than the \$10,000 minimum grant). There are 6 consortia covering 85 school districts. Thus, the total number of subgrantee in this table is 22.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>      </u> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>      </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2,366	2,318	6

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 education programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note:** Section 3301(8) û The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course: (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.	378
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*.	200

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		
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students		
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)		
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community based organization personnel		
Total		

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA is unable to collect this data. NRowch 12.8.2010

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

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

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/22/09	9/11/09	37
<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 Nebraska Department of Education has explored the possibility of providing tentative allocations in the spring of each year to districts in order for the on-line Grants Management System (GMS) to be open as soon as the final Grant Award Notifications are received from the U.S. Department of Education. The SEA has a consolidated grant application process for all NCLB formula grants, including Title III. At this point, this process would require all district grantees to submit an amendment once the final application is received requiring more work for district staff. It was determined that the process currently used (opening the on-line GMS) AFTER allocations are received are more beneficial for districts and may save more time.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	

**Comments:** There are zero schools identified as persistently dangerous. KS 12-13-10

## 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	89.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	68.0
Hispanic	77.0
White, non-Hispanic	93.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	87.0
Female	91.0
<b>Comments:</b> We did not collect student level dropout information for all the years involved in the NCES rate calculations. KS Data for fields left blank are not currently available. KS 12-14-10	

#### 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
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.8
Hispanic	3.0
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	<3
Limited English proficient	4.2
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	<3
Male	<3
Female	<3
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

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

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

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

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

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	245	245
LEAs with subgrants	9	9
Total	254	254
<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	36
K	27	183
1	22	157
2	34	144
3	27	150
4	34	146
5	27	127
6	19	127
7	N<10	121
8	18	108
9	13	202
10	12	126
11	N<10	123
12	13	170
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total	268	1,920
<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	30	716
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	220	1,024
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<10	73
Hotels/Motels	17	107
Total	268	1,920
<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)	36
K	183
1	157
2	144
3	150
4	146
5	127
6	127
7	121
8	108
9	202
10	126
11	123
12	170
Ungraded	N<10
Total	1,920
<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	465
Migratory children/youth	155
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	356
Limited English proficient students	412
<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.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	9
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	9
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	9
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	9
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	9
Coordination between schools and agencies	9
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
School supplies	9
Referral to other programs and services	9
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	9
Other (optional – in comment box below)	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Rental/Utility deposits Waive Fees Backpack Food Program Facilitation
---

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

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	2
Transportation	2
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	3
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Lack of shelters and transportation costs.
--

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	140	55
4	119	53
5	110	37
6	102	35
7	97	45
8	91	29
High School	96	36
<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.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	127	113
4	115	98
5	100	87
6	90	66
7	88	69
8	83	59
High School	91	63
<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)	699
K	238
1	261
2	245
3	248
4	212
5	210
6	219
7	154
8	173
9	214
10	140
11	123
12	85
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	686
Total	3,907

**Comments:** Nebraska has zero ungraded eligible migrant children who can be counted for funding purposes. KS 1-24-10

**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.

3.16.2011

The state of Nebraska had a 13% increase in the number of students reported for Category 1. The increase was due to 1) revisions of child eligibility from the October 2009 Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance; 2) regional recruiters who focused on recruitment of children/youth outside the K-12 setting in project areas and children/youth ages 0-21 in non-project areas.

**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 service 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)	82
K	85
1	109
2	95
3	103
4	78
5	84
6	71
7	37
8	40
9	46
10	21
11	14
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	871

**Comments:** Nebraska has zero students to report for Ungraded and Out-of-School. KS 12-14-10

3.16.2011

The services provided to OSY were interpreted as support services and were not included in the Category 2 Child Count Table.

**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.

3.16.2011

The state of Nebraska had a 15% increase in the number of eligible students reported in the 2009.2010 Category 2. The increase is a reflection of the increase of children in Category 1 and the number of students participating in summer programs.

**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 MIS2000 database system was used to compile and generate the 2009-2010 child count as well as the last count period.

**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 data collected and entered into MIS2000 was from all approved COE's as well as updated information from the projects throughout the year. The data collected for the state of Nebraska: child's name, parents, guardians, address, gender, date of birth, birth city, birth state, birth country, race, school building number, type of enrollment, enrollment date, grade, withdrawal date, withdrawal code, residence only verification date, move from, move to, qualifying arrival date, residency date, priority for service, COE number, project name, project identification code.

The migrant recruiter interviewed potential eligible migrant families. During the interview, the recruiter completed a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) which included a parent signature. Once the recruiter completed the COE, it was submitted to the LEAs Migrant project director, for review and approval. The COE's were then submitted to the state migrant office for review and approval. After the COE is approved at the state level, the initial information is entered into the MIS2000 state database system. Once the initial information is entered into MIS2000 districts are responsible for updating school history data, enroll and withdrawal data, program supplemental codes and priority for service data.

The data collection is an ongoing process. MIS2000 training is provided to the LEA's on procedures for entering data and the requirements for doing so. LEA's have access to MIS2000 and continually update data to ensure enrollment data, priority for service data, and all pertinent education data is current.

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 SEA and the LEA's enter the child's data into the MIS2000 system. The state migrant education program staff generates child count reports from the MIS2000 system. Preliminary reports are made available to the LEA's to re-assess the data for updates and/or corrections. The data is organized through various reports that can be generated by inputting certain parameters (e.g., dates, names, enrollments, etc.). The system is continually monitored for duplication of records, data, etc.

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.

NA

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The report generated is set up in a way that it automatically calculates eligibility based on age 3-21, QAD, and/or residency dates, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, within the 36 month period to assure that only children meeting these criteria are included. When a child is entered into the MIS2000 system, each child is assigned a unique student identification number assigned by MIS2000 which assures that the child is only counted once in both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

3.16.2011

Children/youth determined eligible in the state with a QAD and/or residency date from September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010, documented on the COE would validate residency at least one day during the eligibility period. For eligible children/youth with a QAD and/or residency from September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2009 residing in the state at least one day during the eligibility period September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010 is validated through a verification process using school records, or the recruiter visiting with the family to validate residency during the eligibility period.

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.

NA

### 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.

The State of Nebraska continues to operate a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) approval process in which no COE documenting a new Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) is entered into the Nebraska MIS2000 state system until it has been approved by the State COE Approval Team. Regional recruiters assist the LEA's to ensure that all eligible migrant children are being identified and recruited within the state of Nebraska.

COE's written by the local migrant projects are signed only by recruiters who have received a minimum of 20 hours of state approved Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) training.

The Nebraska Migrant Education Program uses the national Certificate of Eligibility (COE) created by the U. S. Department of Education as the official record to document eligibility determination for each individual child. The LOA's submit COE's to the state migrant office for review, correction if necessary, and approval by the COE Approval Team. The approved COE is signed and dated by the State ID&R Coordinator and submitted to the MIS2000 program analyst for entry into the MIS2000 system. Once the COE data has been entered into the MIS2000 system, the COE is signed and dated by the MIS2000 program analyst. A copy of the state approved COE is sent to the LOA and the original is kept at the state migrant office.

If the COE is not approved by the COE Approval Team, the COE is marked Non-Qualifying (NQ) and kept at the state migrant office. A copy of the COE is sent to the LOA with an explanation of why the children were not determined eligible for the Migrant program.

The recruiter has the option to appeal the decision of the COE Approval Team. The recruiter may submit an appeal form describing the particular circumstances that support the eligibility determination of the family. The appeal form is submitted to the State MEP to be reviewed by the COE Approval Team. The COE appeal process does not guarantee the COE will be approved and requires the final decision of the State ID&R coordinator.

A monthly COE report is provided to the projects that indicate the eligibility determination and status of all COE's submitted to the Migrant office. The data collected will be used for ID&R training. Special attention will be given to high frequency errors. It will be the directive for future trainings to reduce errors. Errors on COE's are recorded and used in training sessions with recruiters.

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 State of Nebraska (MEP) conducted a prospective re-interview process to determine whether children enrolled in the MEP for the 2009-2010 year were properly identified and was eligible to receive services paid for with MEP funds. Re-interview procedures were developed and used to sample an on-going basis of the state's recruited children, re-examine information obtained during an initial interview, and take appropriate steps based on the results.

A core responsibility of each SEA under the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) is to ensure that only those children who are eligible for the MEP are recruited, counted, and served. Meeting this responsibility is key to ensuring that 1) States' direct MEP-funded services only to eligible migrant children; 2) the MEP allocation each State receives reflects its statutory share of the MEP funds that Congress annually appropriates for services to migrant children, and 3) public confidence in the program and its integrity remains strong.

The objectives of the re-interview are to 1) Examine through re-interviewing of parents/guardians/self-eligible youths the validity of an initial interview prior to the sampled youth's inclusion in a state child count; 2) Ensure that only eligible students receive MEP services; 3) identify areas/topics for future recruiter training; 4) Improve overall quality and accuracy of state eligibility determination.

The sampling frame for the Nebraska (MEP) for the 2009-2010 year consists of 3,386 children from 18 district and regional based projects. Each child in the MEP is given a randomly generated identification number that is used as a marker for their file on the MEP database. The number of children in the 2009-2010 re-interview sample was 56.

The sample was generated using the child identification number that was organized in ascending order on the MEP database. An actual sample of a total of 142 children was generated in order to anticipate a large number of children who may have moved away and whose family would not be available to be interviewed. Every 20th child was randomly selected from the database. The sample was then broken down and organized according to project. A total of 14 out of 18 projects were represented in the sample. Replacements were randomly selected for each project that required additional subjects primarily due to the fact that the migrant families moved out of the project. Again, child identification numbers were organized in ascending order at the project level and randomly selected according to the number of replacements requested for that project.

The re-interviewer who conducted the re-interviews was an individual independent from the original recruiter who recruited families in the state. A migrant recruiter accompanied the interviewer to each face to face interview in order to 1) more easily locate the family; 2) introduce the interviewer to the family; and 3) interpret when necessary. The migrant families were not contacted prior to the visit. The interviewer was trained to familiarize them with the basic interviewing pattern. A protocol was developed to provide the re-interviewer with

guidance when setting up and conducting the interviews. A questionnaire was developed to gather the data from the migrant families. The re-interviewer asked open-ended questions and supplemented them with additional probes to help get at the heart of the question. The re-interviewer was instructed not to ask overly leading questions or ask the family member to simply confirm information that is recorded on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). After the questionnaire was completed, the re-interviewer reviewed the COE in order to verify that the information provided during the re-interview was indeed correct. Any discrepancies were noted by the re-interviewer.

Upon completion of the sample for the State of Nebraska, the data was thoroughly examined and eligibility determinations were made. The results of the re-interview process for the reporting period of 2009-2010 was 56 eligibility determinations sampled, 56 re-interviews were completed, and 56 were found to meet eligibility.

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.

Recruitment and data entry training sessions are conducted throughout the year to review significant issues. The comprehensive training helps to ensure the collection and reporting of migrant data. Periodic on-site visits are conducted by state migrant staff. Throughout the year, child reports are provided to each project site to review for updates and corrections. State migrant staff routinely monitors and analyzes the data submitted by projects for accuracy, completeness, and timeliness.

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.

Preliminary child count reports for the regular 12-month and the summer session are submitted to each project site for them to review and to verify that the child continues to reside in the project area, and/or was in school at least one day during the reporting period, and/or provide any other information for that child.

3.16.2011

The state director reviews monthly reports that include child count information by project and statewide basis. The preliminary child count reports submitted by the projects are reviewed by the State director. The review includes a comparison of previous years child count data to include: increase/decrease in the child count, number of students enrolled, particular areas in the state that the increase/decrease occurred.

3.16.2011

The state director reviews monthly reports that include child count information by project and statewide basis. The preliminary child count reports submitted by the projects are reviewed by the State director. The review includes a comparison of previous years child count data to include: increase/decrease in the child count, number of students enrolled, particular areas in the state that the increase/decrease occurred.

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.

Nebraska has revised its Identification and Recruitment Plan for the State. The revised plan indicates improvement made by the State in staff development, technical assistance, and reorganization of the state recruiting plan. Currently the majority of migrant recruiters in the State of Nebraska are hired by local school districts or projects where migrant recruitment is only a part of their job. These recruiters are referred to as project recruiters. The primary focus of the project recruiter is the mission of the district; priority is given to meeting educational needs of the migrant students in a K-12 setting. Their scope of service is limited to the school district or the project with little or no ability to recruit outside defined boundaries, school hours, or school calendar.

3.16.2011

Nebraska has revised its Identification and Recruitment Plan for the State. The revised plan indicates improvement made by the State in staff development, technical assistance, and reorganization of the state recruiting plan. Currently the majority of migrant recruiters in the State of Nebraska are hired by local school districts or projects where migrant recruitment is only part of their job. Most of the recruiters focus on the recruitment of school aged children. Their scope of service is limited to the school district or the project with little or no ability to recruit outside defined boundaries, school hours, or school calendar. The primary focus of these recruiters is the mission of the district with a priority of meeting K-12 educational needs. The Nebraska ID&R plan includes regional recruiters who are responsible for recruiting in areas outside current projects and to address the needs of migrant children who may not currently be enrolled in a school district or other educational settings. The ID&R plan will blend local and state wide perspectives, provide year-round recruitment, and provide ID&R coverage for the entire state with a focus on all aspects of the migrant population. The State ID&R Coordinator's responsibilities include: Review of time and effort logs of all recruiters, identification of training/mentor needs of individual recruiters, Development and presentation of State ID&R trainings, Review of Qualifying Activities, Revision of State ID&R manual, Adopt the Rolling Re-interview procedure to ensure the integrity of the Identification and Recruitment process in the State of Nebraska

3.16.2011

Nebraska has revised its Identification and Recruitment Plan for the State. The revised plan indicates improvement made by the State in staff development, technical assistance, and reorganization of the state recruiting plan. Currently the majority of migrant recruiters in the State of Nebraska are hired by local school districts or projects where migrant recruitment is only part of their job. Most of the recruiters focus on the recruitment of school aged children. Their scope of service is limited to the school district or the project with little or no ability

to recruit outside defined boundaries, school hours, or school calendar. The primary focus of these recruiters is the mission of the district with a priority of meeting K-12 educational needs. The Nebraska ID&R plan includes regional recruiters who are responsible for recruiting in areas outside current projects and to address the needs of migrant children who may not currently be enrolled in a school district or other educational settings. The ID&R plan will blend local and state wide perspectives, provide year-round recruitment, and provide ID&R coverage for the entire state with a focus on all aspects of the migrant population. The State ID&R Coordinator's responsibilities include: Review of time and effort logs of all recruiters, Identification of training/mentor needs of individual recruiters, Development and presentation of State ID&R trainings, Review of Qualifying Activities, Revision of State ID&R manual, Adopt the Rolling Re-interview procedure to ensure the integrity of the Identification and Recruitment process in the State of Nebraska

The Nebraska ID&R plan includes additional recruiters referred to as regional recruiters. The State has a need to recruit in areas outside current projects and to address the needs of migrant children who may not currently be enrolled in school districts or other educational settings.

The ID&R plan is cost effective, but extends recruitment services through the summer months as well as filling geographic gaps currently not being addressed. A referral network has developed between the project recruiters and the regional recruiters. This network increases the likelihood of addressing family needs with support services outside the realm of the school district.

The ID&R plan will blend local and state-wide perspectives, provide year-round recruitment, and provide ID&R coverage for the entire state with a focus on all aspects of the migrant population.

---

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.

3.16.2011

Due to the climate of immigration some families will not talk to the recruiters for fear they are from immigration. The number of on-site recruitment efforts at the processing plants have decreased due to the immigration climate.