

**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

NEVADA



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
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Nevada		
Address: 700 E. Fifth St. Carson City, NV 89701		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Julian Montoya		
Telephone: 775-687-9255		
Fax: 775-687-9118		
e-mail: jmontoya@doe.nv.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Julian Montoya		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 3:33:47 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.

Nevada adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010. The present NV Academic Content Standards will remain in place until the implementation of the CCSS is in place. Presently there is a statewide dissemination plan for the CCSS: a Gap Analysis has been completed for the CCSS and the NV content standards, translation (bridge) documents are being reviewed and will become the basis for assessment, curriculum and instruction in Nevada. The 17 districts are working collaboratively on professional development tools/activities, instruction, curriculum and assessments aligned to the findings of the Gap Analysis.

Full implementation of the ELA Common Core Standards (CCS) will be in place by the end of the 2012-2013 school year; full implementation of the Math CCS is not anticipated until the end of the 2015-16 school year. The earlier deadline for the implementation of the ELA CCS is due to the fact these are much more closely aligned with what Nevada has within its current state ELA standards.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Nevada adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010. The present NV Academic Content Standards will remain in place until the implementation of the CCSS is in place. Presently there is a statewide dissemination plan for the CCSS: a Gap Analysis has been completed for the CCSS and the NV content standards, translation (bridge) documents are being reviewed and will become the basis for assessment, curriculum and instruction in Nevada. The 17 districts are working collaboratively on professional development tools/activities, instruction, curriculum and assessments aligned to the findings of the Gap Analysis. Nevada is building field test items for math and ELA to align with the Common Core State Standards. These items will not be part of the student score but will give Nevada valuable information about the transition from Nevada State Content Standards to Common Core State Standards.

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

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

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	90.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	10.0
Comments:	

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

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	230,173		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,414		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	19,590		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	26,100		>97
Hispanic	85,951		>97
White, non-Hispanic	95,117		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,893		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	36,221		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	113,842		>97
Migratory students	41		>97
Male	118,135		>97
Female	112,030		>97

Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.

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	6,896	29.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,892	63.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,859	7.9
Total	23,647	

Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.

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	230,173		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,414		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	19,590		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	26,100		>97
Hispanic	85,951		>97
White, non-Hispanic	95,117		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,893		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	36,221		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	113,842		>97
Migratory students	41		>97
Male	118,135		>97
Female	112,030		>97
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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	12,731	53.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,051	38.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,854	7.8
Total	23,636	
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.		

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	95,514		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,422		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,295		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	10,847		>97
Hispanic	34,128		>97
White, non-Hispanic	40,822		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,834		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,664		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	42,852		>97
Migratory students	16		>97
Male	48,781		>97
Female	46,728		>97
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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	3,445	35.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,415	56.4
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	749	7.8
Total	9,609	
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,909	22,484	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	480	280	58.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,821	2,228	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,822	1,870	48.9
Hispanic	13,422	7,999	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	13,363	10,107	75.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,364	1,371	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,472	5,262	55.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18,824	10,837	57.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,364	11,570	66.6
Female	16,545	10,914	66.0
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,912	20,678	61.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	480	269	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,820	2,121	75.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,823	1,805	47.2
Hispanic	13,417	6,721	50.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,371	9,762	73.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,367	1,084	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,466	3,963	41.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,822	9,398	49.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,372	9,990	57.5
Female	16,540	10,688	64.6
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We do not test in Science for Grade 3.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,636	22,326	66.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	494	296	59.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,772	2,186	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,819	1,920	50.3
Hispanic	13,017	7,690	59.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,534	10,234	75.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,625	1,375	37.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,027	3,922	48.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,252	10,377	56.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,531	11,502	65.6
Female	16,105	10,824	67.2
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,666	21,935	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	494	306	61.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,773	2,081	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,825	1,996	52.2
Hispanic	13,039	7,093	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,535	10,459	77.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,625	1,108	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,040	3,074	38.2
Economically disadvantaged students	18,275	9,953	54.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,548	10,849	61.8
Female	16,118	11,086	68.8
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We do not test in Science for Grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,589	22,326	66.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	483	257	53.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,873	2,306	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,805	1,910	50.2
Hispanic	12,874	7,675	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	13,554	10,178	75.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,620	1,261	34.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,884	2,545	43.3
Economically disadvantaged students	17,943	10,304	57.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,252	11,269	65.3
Female	16,337	11,057	67.7
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,613	18,062	53.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	483	207	42.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,876	1,898	66.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,807	1,492	39.2
Hispanic	12,890	5,290	41.0
White, non-Hispanic	13,557	9,175	67.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,623	818	22.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,897	998	16.9
Economically disadvantaged students	17,967	7,465	41.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,256	8,866	51.4
Female	16,357	9,196	56.2
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,549	17,216	51.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	482	216	44.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,873	1,745	60.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,796	1,249	32.9
Hispanic	12,863	4,925	38.3
White, non-Hispanic	13,535	9,081	67.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,613	985	27.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,897	1,041	17.7
Economically disadvantaged students	17,919	6,882	38.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,230	9,193	53.4
Female	16,319	8,023	49.2
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,548	21,471	64.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	517	309	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,785	2,194	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,765	1,664	44.2
Hispanic	12,929	7,022	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	13,552	10,282	75.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,532	955	27.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,322	1,182	27.3
Economically disadvantaged students	17,383	9,132	52.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,205	10,830	62.9
Female	16,340	10,641	65.1
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,558	21,982	65.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	517	314	60.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,784	2,152	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,765	1,854	49.2
Hispanic	12,933	7,210	55.7
White, non-Hispanic	13,559	10,452	77.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,537	864	24.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,323	939	21.7
Economically disadvantaged students	17,390	9,449	54.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	17,214	10,329	60.0
Female	16,341	11,652	71.3
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We do not test in Science for Grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,037	21,580	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	494	305	61.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,882	2,306	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,767	1,829	48.6
Hispanic	12,275	6,640	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,619	10,500	77.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,378	854	25.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,647	857	23.5
Economically disadvantaged students	16,220	8,742	53.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	16,943	11,006	65.0
Female	16,094	10,574	65.7
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,031	24,434	74.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	495	351	70.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,881	2,424	84.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,768	2,334	61.9
Hispanic	12,267	7,927	64.6
White, non-Hispanic	13,620	11,398	83.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,383	998	29.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,641	957	26.3
Economically disadvantaged students	16,218	10,383	64.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	16,932	11,726	69.3
Female	16,099	12,708	78.9
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We do not test in Science for Grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,861	18,377	55.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	508	244	48.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,826	2,126	75.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,698	1,492	40.3
Hispanic	11,980	5,315	44.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,849	9,200	66.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,349	668	19.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,957	482	16.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15,274	6,725	44.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	16,817	9,328	55.5
Female	16,040	9,049	56.4
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,959	21,775	66.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	512	310	60.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,830	2,207	78.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,701	1,924	52.0
Hispanic	12,017	6,726	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	13,899	10,608	76.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,356	818	24.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,972	453	15.2
Economically disadvantaged students	15,326	8,430	55.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	16,869	10,345	61.3
Female	16,086	11,430	71.1
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,781	16,114	49.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	511	214	41.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,826	1,765	62.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,672	1,175	32.0
Hispanic	11,939	4,159	34.8
White, non-Hispanic	13,833	8,801	63.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,311	622	18.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,954	182	6.2
Economically disadvantaged students	15,206	5,362	35.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	16,752	8,561	51.1
Female	16,025	7,553	47.1
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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	28,431	20,492	72.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	417	277	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,565	2,127	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,236	1,632	50.4
Hispanic	9,065	5,597	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	13,148	10,859	82.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,714	788	29.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,737	482	27.7
Economically disadvantaged students	9,304	5,642	60.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	14,366	10,459	72.8
Female	14,064	10,032	71.3
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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	28,426	26,747	94.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	411	386	93.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,567	2,470	96.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,233	2,846	88.0
Hispanic	9,077	8,294	91.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,138		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,682	1,781	66.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,732	1,137	65.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9,303	8,388	90.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	14,337	13,304	92.8
Female	14,088	13,442	95.4
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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	27,822	21,979	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	304	74.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,539	2,166	85.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,162	1,909	60.4
Hispanic	8,915	6,126	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	12,796	11,474	89.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,660	1,043	39.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,699	435	25.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9,162	6,220	67.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	14,056	11,409	81.2
Female	13,766	10,570	76.8
Comments: Data has been checked and is accurate.			

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	591	271	45.9
Districts	17	16	94.1
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	235	75	31.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	223	69	30.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	12	6	50.0
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
17	16	94.1
Comments:		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
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	62
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
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	62
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Nevada school districts that chose the "other" option for restructuring were required to demonstrate that the LEA had taken a far more proactive role in providing technical assistance and monitoring for these low-performing schools. The approach was two pronged: the LEA had to demonstrate that it was demanding more accountability from the school in carrying out the actions outlined in the school's restructuring plan, and it had to show, to the LEA's satisfaction, that more technical assistance and support was being provided to the school in carrying out the restructuring plan. For assistance, if specific professional development for teachers was required under the restructuring plan, the LEA had to demonstrate how it would follow up after the professional development to ensure that those practices were indeed being implemented in classrooms, and it had to describe what would happen if the teachers were unable or unwilling to change their instructional practices after the professional development was provided. Through this method, the LEA was required both to provide support and to demand accountability for change in these low-performing schools.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No Nevada districts were identified for improvement for the 2010-2011 school year based on 2009-2010 assessment data. However, Nevada is continuously updating its state-wide system of support for districts in corrective action, including updating the comprehensive audit process to be implemented when a district does reach this stage of improvement.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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	203	153
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/15/10
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	67,915	70,097
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	36,166	35,945
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	53.3	51.3
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	68,059	70,049
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	37,835	36,283
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	55.6	51.8
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	22
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	12

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

Comments:

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used	Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies) (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		35	7	10	A	
2		22	1	3	A	
3		2	0	1	B	
4		2	0	0	A	
5	student interventions provided during and out of school hours; extended school day/year; technology and technology supplies; leveled student books; parent involvement liaison	61	2	7	C	
6 = Combo 1	strategies 1 and 2	4	0	1	A	
7 = Combo 2	strategies 1 and 5 (5 includes same activities as listed in 5 above)	9	2	2	A	
8 = Combo 3	strategies 2 and 4	2	0	0	B	
Comments:						

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

comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A= Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
--

B = Increased teacher retention

C =Improved parental involvement

D =Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) has developed a statewide conference format to disseminate information on effective strategies to schools and LEAs across the state. In addition to NDE's participation in the National Title I Distinguished Schools program that annually honors two of each state's highest performing Title I schools, the Nevada Department of Education sponsors a Mega Conference every spring. During this conference all Nevada schools that have made significant academic growth are recognized by our State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In addition, these schools are asked to make a presentation during the conference on successful strategies and practices that enabled them to achieve the growth and success that they have attained.

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.

NCLB, Section 1117(a)(4)(A)(ii) states that an SEA's statewide system of support shall include, "providing such support as the State educational agency determines necessary and available in order to ensure the effectiveness of such teams." The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) has approached this requirement of NCLB by funding its annual training for our School Support Team Leaders (SSTLs) in part from the Section 1003(g) set aside. The SSTLs are a cadre of retired school district superintendents, principals, and other individuals who are selected through an application and screening process as the leaders of our School Support Teams (SSTs). NDE develops its SSTL annual summer training institute on areas identified as needed based on a three- areas of consideration:

- Annual review of identified needs in the schools that will be assigned SSTs;
- Overall feedback from NDE and LEA representatives that serve on SSTs; and
- Overall feedback from the SSTLs themselves through ongoing communication with NDE staff and formal evaluations of services provided.

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.

Due to the continued economic downturn in Nevada's economy and the continued decrease in state funding for all programs, not just education, Nevada's biannual legislature has not allocated any additional funding to support school improvement efforts since 2007. Some of the funding dedicated to this purpose during the 2007 legislative session was returned by school districts as noted in the 2008-2009 CSPR.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	53,257
Applied to transfer	1,858
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,041
Comments: This data will need to be revised during the validation process.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,872,254

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	1

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 or improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	35,579
Applied for supplemental educational services	6,965
Received supplemental educational services	6,524
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 7,981,838
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	48,778	45,406	93.1	3,372	6.9
All elementary classes	12,168	11,689	96.1	479	3.9
All secondary classes	36,610	33,717	92.1	2,893	7.9
NDE Edfacts coordinator has submitted adjusted N63 and N64 files to Edfacts that will hopefully rectify this situation.					

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	50.1
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	49.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	58.7
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	41.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	3,126	2,989	95.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,302	3,068	92.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	7,849	6,777	86.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	8,345	7,816	93.7
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	71.0	26.0
Poverty metric used	The percentage of core academic classes taught by HQ teachers in high-poverty elementary schools is higher than in low-poverty elementary schools.	
Secondary schools	52.0	21.0
Poverty metric used	% of free and reduced eligible students	

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.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	NA
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Heritage language	Native American, Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	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	73,498
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	86,131
Comments: The numbers in 1.6.2.2 differ from those in 1.6.2.1 because the numbers in 1.6.2.2 are self-reported by the LEAs whereas those in 1.6.2.1 are generated by our state data system. The occurrence of such discrepancies is being addressed.	

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	63,767
Tagalog	4,411
Filipino; Pilipino	1,655
Vietnamese	1,094
Chinese	1,049

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The numbers were recalculated for this answer and it was discovered that LEAs had errors in their self-reported data for this item. The occurrence of such discrepancies is being addressed. In addition, there is the issue of students having spoken language that are not included in the calculations for 1.6.2.3.

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	73,424
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	762
Total	74,186
Comments: The numbers in 1.6.3.1.1 differ from those in 1.6.2.1 because the numbers in 1.6.3.1.1 are self-reported by the LEAs whereas those in 1.6.2.1 are generated by our state data system. The occurrence of such discrepancies is being addressed.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10,791
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14.7
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	73,318
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	751
Total	74,069
Comments: The numbers in 1.6.3.2.1 differ from those in 1.6.2.2 because these numbers are self-reported by the LEAs and LEAs had a lot of turnover among Title III personnel at the same time that the SEA Title III consultant retired. The occurrence of such discrepancies is being addressed.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	14,623

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	37,597	64.1	29,934	51.00
Attained proficiency	11,462	15.6	8,335	14.20
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
6,989	7,496	14,485
Comments:		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,477	9,850	68.0	4,627
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,473	10,060	69.5	4,413
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,016	2,146	42.8	2,870
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	10
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	10
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	10
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	10
# - 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)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

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 three</u> Title III AMAOs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
8,105	145	2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

Note: Section 3301(8) 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.	2,411
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators, and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	6	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	7	
Other (Explain in comment box)	1	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	15,875
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	9	13,226
PD provided to principals	9	1,274
PD provided to administrators other than principals	7	648
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	8	1,403
PD provided to community based organization personnel	3	4,635
Total	45	37,061

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: professional development was provided to secondary teachers in Literacy teaching strategies as this was not provided to these teachers through other means.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/7/10	7/21/10	14
Comments:		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A shorter time is not necessary.

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 were no such schools identified in Nevada.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROP OUT 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	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	57.7
Hispanic	60.5
White, non-Hispanic	79.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	69.5
Female	73.0
Comments: Nevada has not collected this data on IEP, LEP, FRL, and Migrant students in the past. However, these data will be included within the longitudinal data system and will begin to be collected during the FY11-12 school year.	

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	4.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	5.0
Hispanic	5.2
White, non-Hispanic	3.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	4.5
Female	3.9
Comments: Nevada has not collected this data on IEP, LEP, FRL, and Migrant students in the past. However, these data will be included within the longitudinal data system and will begin to be collected during the FY11-12 school year.	

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	7	7
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	17	17
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	161
K	N<10	909
1	N<10	913
2	N<10	784
3	N<10	822
4	N<10	758
5	N<10	652
6	N<10	648
7	N<10	584
8	N<10	550
9	N<10	537
10	N<10	542
11	N<10	434
12	N<10	500
Ungraded	N<10	21
Total	26	8,815
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	N<10	673
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	13	5,958
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<10	267
Hotels/Motels	N<10	1,917
Total	26	8,815
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	161
K	909
1	913
2	784
3	822
4	758
5	652
6	648
7	584
8	550
9	537
10	542
11	434
12	500
Ungraded	21
Total	8,815
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	228
Migratory children/youth	N<10
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,082
Limited English proficient students	1,314
Comments:	

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	4
Staff professional development and awareness	6
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	5
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	5
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	6
Counseling	5
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	7
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	4
School Selection	3
Transportation	2
School records	2
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		

Comments: Comments: Grade #Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assess.Test

3 681

4 627

5 534

6 709

7 487

8 433

High School 795

Grade #Homeless Child./Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient.

3 287

4 289

5 196

6 236

7 277

8 175

High School 582

Nevada is in the process of implementing a Homeless flag within our Student Information System that will enable us to capture Homeless assessment information. We have not had a homeless flag in the past and were only able to report missing when we reported the assessment data. Currently our Homeless consultant has been gathering this data from her providers independently from the SIS for the CSPR. It is Nevada's intention to be able to provide these counts for ED Facts for this upcoming 2010-2011 school year.

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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		

Comments: Grade #Homeless Child./Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assess. Test

3 662
 4 616
 5 520
 6 523
 7 477
 8 429
 High School 956

Grade #Homeless Child./Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Profic.

3 319
 4 296
 5 262
 6 229
 7 229
 8 139
 High School 417

Nevada is in the process of implementing a Homeless flag within our Student Information System that will enable us to capture Homeless assessment information. We have not had a homeless flag in the past and were only able to report missing when we reported the assessment data. Currently our Homeless consultant has been gathering this data from her providers independently from the SIS for the CSPR. It is Nevada's intention to be able to provide these counts for EDFacts for this upcoming 2010-2011 school year.

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 pre-schoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	36
K	15
1	13
2	11
3	17
4	15
5	13
6	13
7	15
8	12
9	13
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	201

Comments:

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 count for 2008 was 240 students and the Category 1 count for 2009 was 195 students. This decrease is the result of the steady decline in the number of migratory workers in Nevada over the past several years. The local recruiters state they are actively seeking migrant students, but the students are not to be found. One of Nevada's districts, Carson City School District, has elected not to have a Migrant Education Program for the 2010/2011 school year because of the dramatic decrease in the number of eligible students. A second district, Washoe County School District, has stated that this may be the final year for their MEP program because of the decreasing numbers.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	23
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count for 2009 was 40 students, and the Category 2 count for 2010 was 23 students. Although this decrease is greater than 10 percent, the actual numbers are so small that the decrease is not that significant. The decrease occurred because some districts had the migrant students participate in the summer school programs sponsored by the individual districts.

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.

Nevada has used the MIS 2000 program for a number of years to generate the Category 1 child count and continued to do so in 2009. The Category 2 child count is also generated using a specially designed component of the MIS 2000 system. All districts providing summer school services submit a report that identifies each participant by name, age, birth date and mother's last name. The information is inputted into the program that identifies any duplication of participants. Although Nevada will continue to be linked to MIS2000, the state is currently developing an electronic COE that will automatically feed the information into the new system called MAPS. MAPS is not yet totally operational, and Nevada is currently using both systems to generate the required data.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 Child Counts: Each year new COEs are generated by each of the districts participating in or wanting to participate in the Migrant Education Program. Using face-to-face interviews, each of the local recruiters completes a new COE for all migrant youth. Data collected on each COE form includes the following: father's name, mother's name, male guardian's name, female guardian's name, address, and racial/ethnic group.

Information collected for each child in the household ages 3-21 includes the following: name, sex, birth date, place of birth, school name, grade in school, participation in special education programs, information about special health data, and status of immunizations.

Additional information collected on each COE includes the following: qualifying activity, residency date, termination/withdrawal date, type of employment generating the move (seasonal, agriculture, fishing, etc.), status of eligibility (identifies years classified as migrant), date of move qualifying the student as a migratory student, name of individual supplying information, signature of recruiter, signature of parent or guardian, and date.

Information is also collected on other children in the home who are between the ages of 0-3 years old. This information includes name, sex, date of birth, verification, and birthplace.

The identified recruiter in each district has the responsibility for completing the COE for each child. The recruiters are encouraged to complete the COE immediately upon the identification of the migrant child, and thus COEs are completed at any time during the year. All COEs must be submitted to the data collection center by September 15 of each year. The district retains a copy of the COE and the original COE is sent to the data collection center, located in the Churchill County School District. After all COEs are received by the data collection center, the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews and approves each COE. The COE form includes a space where the Director initials the COE to indicate approval. Those COEs not acceptable and those needing corrections or additional information are returned to the local district.

The form used to submit data for the Category 2 list of migrant youth participating in summer school programs is transmitted to each district in June. Each district is required to submit the list that includes name, age, grade and identifying information to the data collection center by September 15 of each year. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews and approves data submitted to the data collection center prior to the information being finalized and reports generated.

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.

One person, located in Churchill County School District, enters the data from all COEs generated statewide into the computer system. The data input person reviews the data entered into the computer and then the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews each COE for accuracy and completeness. Any COE that the data input operator or the Migrant Education Director questions is returned to the district recruiter for completion or for verification of accuracy.

The MIS2000 program has a special menu that allows the data input person to develop a "Suspected Duplicate" list. Based on the traits identified by the operator, the list can be developed based on a large number of factors. In most instances, the Nevada operator has the computer program cross-reference the combination of the student names and birth dates of all youth entered into the system for duplications. If duplication is identified on that list, it is further analyzed based on mother's name to determine if a record is duplicated. The computer program highlights names it has classified as duplicates, and the data entry clerk reviews this list. After any instances of duplication are resolved, the statewide data input person generates a statewide list as well as a unique list for each district at the end of the year. The fact that Nevada has a single data entry operator and data entry site dramatically decreases the number of duplicate entries. States with multiple data entry locations have a much larger duplicate count because intrastate moves of a child will result in the child being entered into the system multiple times with multiple identification numbers.

Nevada's process allows each district to review the list of students identified for the individual district for accuracy prior to submission to the SEA for review. After the district review, the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director (SEA) approves the count numbers for each district as well as the statewide count information. Category 2 students are entered into a summer school component of the MIS2000 system. The computer program analyzes the data for the Category 2 child count to reveal any duplication of names and to also verify that the individual child was included in the Category 1 child count.

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 same process was used for both the Category 1 count and the Category 2 count.

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.

Category 1: The COE forms and the MIS 2000 program are designed to capture the following information: 1) That the child is between the ages of 3-21; 2) That the child had not graduated from high school; 3) That the date was within 36 months of the QAD; and 4) That the child has had his/her 3rd birthday before August 31, 2009 and was still resident after the birthday occurred.

The MIS2000 program is designed to determine each student's eligibility and the operator highlights for review any file not meeting the program's criteria. In addition, all COEs are reviewed for accuracy and eligibility by the local coordinator, the data input operator and the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director. The review by the SEA is verified by the initials of the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director on each of the COE forms. The SEA reviews all COEs for accuracy and completeness prior to their entry into the computer system, and the computer program determines duplication.

The Migrant summer school program count is reported at the end of the summer school session by each participating district. The district completes an enrollment list that includes child identifying information and submits this list to the data collection center. The form used by each district to submit the data includes the name of the school, the dates of the summer school session and the signature of the local migrant education coordinator. The Nevada Department of Education maintains a list of the regular school year for each district in the state, and the SEA compares this list to the dates identified for summer school programs to determine the dates of the regular school and the summer school do not overlap. The data collection center operator verifies that each child identified on the list is a valid migrant education participant included in the Category 1 child count on the MIS2000 program.

The summer enrollment list is designed to capture the following information: 1) That the child is between the ages of 3-21, 2) That the child had not graduated from high school, 3) That the date was within 36 months of the QAD, and 4) That the child has had his/her 3rd birthday before August 31, 2009 and was still resident after the birthday occurred

If the child is an appropriate participant, the data operator enters the child into a program that determines if the combination of the name and birth date of the individual child is an unduplicated combined name and birth date for the summer school program. If duplication is discovered, the program automatically checks for mother's name to determine if a record is duplicated. The computer program highlights names it has classified as duplicates, and the data entry clerk reviews this list. The program also verifies that the child is included in the Category 1 component of the system. The count for Category 2 includes students who have attended the summer school program sponsored totally, or in part, by Title I, Part C funds. The summer school student list is sent to both the SEA and the LEA for review and verification.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same process was used for both the Category 1 count and the Category 2 count.

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 local program coordinator reviews the data on the COE that is produced each year for each child. The data input person and the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director also checks for accuracy and eligibility. When entered into the computer database the program cross references for duplications. This review process occurs with both the Category 1 and the Category 2 children.

Specific activities related to quality control includes the following:

1. Nevada has a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that is used statewide and all districts are required to use this form. This COE is being revised in an electronic format and will meet the requirements of the national COE.
2. Although the information requested on the COE remains the same from year to year, each year the SEA changes the color of the COE form. This is a quick and easy way to verify that each COE submitted is a new COE for the identified time period.
3. Recently the COE form was revised to more closely replicate the legal declarations identified by OME. Nevada conducts an annual Recruiter Training Session to verify all recruiters were able to accurately complete this revised form.
4. Incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs are returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation and/or verification. In addition, the central input personnel will keep a list of recruiters or districts that submit questionable COEs and the Migrant Education Director will personally visit these individuals and provide additional technical assistance.
5. All recruiters are required to determine student eligibility based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult. Such interviews are conducted prior to completion of the COE.
6. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director oversees and verifies the training of recruiters. Training includes information related to eligibility requirements (including the basic eligibility definition), principal means of livelihood, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, industrial surveys, etc. Intensive training is mandatory for all newly identified recruiters.
7. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director provides recruiters with written eligibility guidelines.
8. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director routinely reviews eligibility documentation as part of regular monitoring and program visits.
9. The Migrant Education Program has a policy of resolving minor discrepancies at the lowest level possible, but also has identified local and state-level processes for resolving eligibility questions.
10. The Migrant Education Director periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises procedures.
11. In addition, the Nevada Department of Education conducts ongoing professional development activities not only to district Migrant Directors and Recruiters, but also to related personnel. With the small population in the state, Nevada cross trains various individuals such as Title I Directors, Title III Directors and school secretaries in various issues related to the identification of eligible migrant students.
12. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews student attendance at summer school projects through both site visits to the programs and a review of attendance lists.
13. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director ensures the quality of interviewers' eligibility decisions by visiting programs, participating in informal meetings with program participants and the review of local records and documentation. In addition, local program providers are aware that they can contact the Migrant Education Program Director at any time if they feel the local program is not in compliance with state and federal requirements.

Prior to the start of the summer school sessions, all districts are provided written procedures on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data and copies of the required reporting materials.

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.

In order to test the accuracy of Nevada's MEP eligibility, every fifth child was in the pool to be re-interviewed. Since Nevada is a large geographic state, it is not the most effective use of the SEA's time to visit each program site for the re-interview process. The process used to initially screen out valid COEs was to telephone the principal of the school the child was attending and have the principal verify the status of the child. Since most of the migrant students in Nevada attend small, rural schools the principals know the family situation of the

individual students. If the principal could name the employer of the parent or guardian and also verify the date the child enrolled in school, then the COE was considered valid. If the principal named an employer the SEA was not familiar with the SEA contacted the employer to verify that the work met MEP requirements. If the principal was not able to verify eligibility the family was contacted by telephone by a bilingual staff member of the SEA.

This process worked well in the rural areas and every principal the SEA contacted was able to provide the necessary information. Of the 38 (total population of 195 less 7 in Washoe County divided by 5) students identified in rural areas, all of the principals were able to provide sufficient information to confirm eligibility.

However, in Reno the schools are much larger and the principals were not as knowledgeable of the personal histories of the students. Since the principals were not able to confirm the eligibility, the district director personally met with the migrant families and confirmed the eligibility.

Of the 45 (38 from rural areas and 7 from Reno) migrant students identified for re-evaluation, all 45 were found to be eligible for migrant education services.

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.

In addition to items previously addressed, Nevada has eight (8) professional staff members of the Department of Education who are assigned responsibility for oversight of Title I, Part A; Title I, School Improvement; and Title III activities in specified school districts. During the school year, these Title I and Title III Consultants make periodic site visits to each of the districts to provide technical assistance and oversight of the Title I and Title III programs. These visits verify that students are receiving required services and assistance with specific emphasis on meeting the educational needs of the migrant and LEP students. Although Nevada has eight (8) positions approved for these roles, there are currently two (2) vacancies.

During the spring of each year, the assigned Title I Consultant conducts a formal review where a prescribed checklist is used to determine compliance with Title I, Part A requirements. One of the questions asked of principals and other site-specific staff is how the needs of the migrant students are being met through the Title I services. Those schools who are unable to provide an acceptable response to the question are identified in the formal report sent to the district and those schools are offered technical assistance in ways to meet the education needs of migrant students.

The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director also conducts periodic visits to all programs/districts receiving migrant education funds. Most visits are informal in nature and are designed to provide technical assistance and guidance to local personnel. However, during the spring of each year, a formal monitor visit is conducted where all programs respond to specific questions and are asked to provide specific documentation verifying appropriate activities and records. During this visit, the program's records are reviewed to determine if the information is in agreement with the data submitted on the COEs to the data collection center. The monitor visit includes interviews with local program providers, youth participants, and parents as well as district administrative personnel. The SEA thus determines if students are receiving the educational services needed, first by Title I, Part A and then by Title I, Part C. In general, most students served by the Migrant Education are also receiving services of Title III for Limited English Proficient students.

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.

Nevada has adopted a system where only one person in the state enters the data into the computer system. When each district completes a COE on a new child, the district retains a copy of the COE and the original is sent to Churchill County School District where the data for the entire State is entered into the system. At the conclusion of the eligibility period, the data coordinator reviews all of the COEs for accuracy, completeness and to verify there is no duplication of students. A district list is sent to each district for review and comment. If there is a concern stated from any of the involved parties, the data input person, the State Migrant Education Director, and the district coordinator jointly review the identified records. After all district, input review and paper reviews are completed, the SEA does a final review of all COEs.

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.

Considering that Nevada currently has 100% accuracy, there is no reason to initiate additional controls at this time. If the current process shows problems in the future, then changes will be made.

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.

At this time, Nevada does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. If anything, Nevada is underreporting our student numbers. Recruiters are all informed to err on the side of caution. If a particular child or family does not meet all of the COE requirements, the recruiter is instructed not to include that child or family in the child count. However, if the recruiter notes that the child or family requires special services, the recruiter will refer the family to the appropriate education or social service agency even though the child is not included in the migrant child count.