

**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

SOUTH CAROLINA



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: South Carolina Department of Education		
Address: 1429 Senate Street Columbia, SC 29201		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Bobby Rykard		
Telephone: 803-734-8110		
Fax: 803-734-3290		
e-mail: rrykard@ed.sc.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Mick Zais		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 10:34:35 AM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



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

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

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

On July 14, 2010, the State Board of Education and the Education Oversight Committee approved using the Common Core State Standards developed by the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers as our state standards for ELA and math with full implementation in the 2014-15 school year. A timeline for the planning and phasing in of these standards is included below.

**TRANSITION TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS**

Timeline Process

2009-2011 Adoption and Communication

Planning and Alignment

2011-2012 Transition and Training

2012-2013 Implementation (Bridge Year)

2013-2014 Implementation (Bridge Year)

2014-2015 Full Implementation and Assessment
Evaluation and Ongoing Support

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) was developed and administered for the first time in spring 2009. PASS includes grades 3-8 and tests in writing, ELA (reading and research), mathematics, science, and social studies. The state submitted phase-one documentation for Peer Review in spring 2009. No revisions or changes are planned grades 3-8.

No revisions or changes are planned for high school assessments in English language arts or mathematics.

No revisions or changes are planned for the alternate assessment (SC-Alt) for grades 3-8 or for high school ELA and mathematics.

The state has administered physical science assessments in high school for both general and alternate assessments. The state will administer biology assessments in place of physical science beginning in 2009-10. The assessment for the general assessment is an end-of-course assessment.

The state plans to implement the Common Core State Standards in 2011-12.

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)	0.0
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	100.0
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"/> No
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"/> No
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	376,165		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,569		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,125		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	142,421		>97
Hispanic	19,781		>97
White, non-Hispanic	204,435		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,527		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	16,983		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	212,919		>97
Migratory students	131		>97
Male	192,670		>97
Female	183,451		>97
Comments:			

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	16,438	33.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,726	60.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,738	5.6
Total	48,902	
Comments: SC does not currently offer an alternate assessment based on grade level achievement standards or based on modified achievement standards.		

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	376,191		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,569		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,126		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	142,429		>97
Hispanic	19,785		>97
White, non-Hispanic	204,448		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,535		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,988		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	212,938		>97
Migratory students	131		>97
Male	192,686		>97
Female	183,461		>97
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	16,999	34.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,179	59.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,750	5.6
Total	48,928	
Comments: SC does not currently offer an alternate assessment based on grade level achievement standards or based on modified achievement standards.		

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	215,501		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	951		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,505		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	81,223		>97
Hispanic	11,689		>97
White, non-Hispanic	117,062		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	28,729		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,438		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	124,393		>97
Migratory students	71		>97
Male	110,118		>97
Female	105,361		>97
Comments:			

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	9,955	34.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,032	59.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,713	6.0
Total	28,700	
Comments: SC does not currently offer an alternate assessment based on grade level achievement standards or based on modified achievement standards.		

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	55,226	44,594	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	207	86.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,028	959	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,873	14,493	69.4
Hispanic	3,547	2,694	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,241	25,993	88.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,007	4,265	53.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,656	2,813	76.9
Economically disadvantaged students	33,285	24,476	73.5
Migratory students	29	20	69.0
Male	28,217	22,357	79.2
Female	27,008	22,236	82.3
Comments:			

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	55,150	49,920	90.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	218	90.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,003	968	96.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,867	17,851	85.5
Hispanic	3,513	3,064	87.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,233	27,547	94.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,008	5,676	70.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,584	3,133	87.4
Economically disadvantaged students	33,232	28,839	86.8
Migratory students	28	25	89.3
Male	28,182	24,925	88.4
Female	26,967	24,994	92.7
Comments:			

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	27,615	15,507	56.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	132	86	65.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	485	353	72.8
Black, non-Hispanic	10,442	3,715	35.6
Hispanic	1,794	789	44.0
White, non-Hispanic	14,611	10,466	71.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,909	1,273	32.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,823	802	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,639	7,148	43.0
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	13,989	7,832	56.0
Female	13,625	7,675	56.3
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	55,381	47,448	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	195	89.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	991	931	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	21,010	16,121	76.7
Hispanic	3,273	2,736	83.6
White, non-Hispanic	29,591	27,200	91.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,724	4,365	56.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,239	2,696	83.2
Economically disadvantaged students	32,908	26,319	80.0
Migratory students	26	21	80.8
Male	28,266	23,936	84.7
Female	27,110	23,508	86.7
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	55,310	46,677	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	191	87.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	971	897	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,007	15,973	76.0
Hispanic	3,239	2,493	77.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,585	26,867	90.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,722	3,907	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,173	2,398	75.6
Economically disadvantaged students	32,866	25,640	78.0
Migratory students	26	16	61.5
Male	28,224	22,924	81.2
Female	27,081	23,750	87.7
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	55,279	38,332	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	159	72.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	991	841	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,960	10,726	51.2
Hispanic	3,269	2,054	62.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,544	24,326	82.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,629	3,004	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,235	1,976	61.1
Economically disadvantaged students	32,834	19,028	58.0
Migratory students	26	11	42.3
Male	28,195	19,742	70.0
Female	27,079	18,588	68.6
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	54,015	44,161	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	172	79.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	883	824	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,168	14,430	71.5
Hispanic	2,895	2,294	79.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,595	26,226	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,114	3,305	46.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,743	2,122	77.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31,623	23,645	74.8
Migratory students	16	12	75.0
Male	27,692	22,231	80.3
Female	26,319	21,929	83.3
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	53,955	48,142	89.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	199	92.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	865	820	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,164	16,783	83.2
Hispanic	2,861	2,475	86.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,594	27,631	93.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,114	4,502	63.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,679	2,270	84.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31,584	26,779	84.8
Migratory students	16	13	81.2
Male	27,658	24,012	86.8
Female	26,293	24,128	91.8
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	26,947	17,812	66.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	83	75.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	429	353	82.3
Black, non-Hispanic	9,997	4,870	48.7
Hispanic	1,479	828	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	14,805	11,594	78.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,524	1,139	32.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,386	718	51.8
Economically disadvantaged students	15,809	8,635	54.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	13,746	9,144	66.5
Female	13,198	8,667	65.7
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	53,323	42,227	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	208	81.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	783	722	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,228	13,864	68.5
Hispanic	2,777	2,108	75.9
White, non-Hispanic	29,015	25,122	86.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,936	2,833	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,203	1,553	70.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30,703	21,862	71.2
Migratory students	23	15	65.2
Male	27,414	20,750	75.7
Female	25,901	21,473	82.9
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	53,277	43,315	81.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	215	84.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	770	707	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,233	14,407	71.2
Hispanic	2,740	2,098	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	29,015	25,679	88.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,941	3,181	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,148	1,502	69.9
Economically disadvantaged students	30,670	22,589	73.7
Migratory students	23	16	69.6
Male	27,394	21,238	77.5
Female	25,875	22,071	85.3
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	26,551	16,237	61.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	137	76	55.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	387	303	78.3
Black, non-Hispanic	10,115	4,206	41.6
Hispanic	1,329	679	51.1
White, non-Hispanic	14,446	10,896	75.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,531	953	27.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,070	438	40.9
Economically disadvantaged students	15,302	7,373	48.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	13,542	8,190	60.5
Female	13,005	8,046	61.9
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	52,422	41,469	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	203	84.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	803	751	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	19,727	13,220	67.0
Hispanic	2,571	1,988	77.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,852	25,123	87.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,545	2,662	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,299	1,729	75.2
Economically disadvantaged students	29,173	20,556	70.5
Migratory students	15	N<10	
Male	26,939	20,696	76.8
Female	25,479	20,770	81.5
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	52,353	41,997	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	193	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	787	717	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	19,728	13,688	69.4
Hispanic	2,528	1,945	76.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,846	25,273	87.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,541	2,923	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,225	1,640	73.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29,130	20,921	71.8
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	26,906	20,672	76.8
Female	25,443	21,322	83.8
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	52,320	38,413	73.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	175	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	799	712	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	19,691	11,744	59.6
Hispanic	2,566	1,753	68.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,796	23,855	82.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,457	2,194	34.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,294	1,444	62.9
Economically disadvantaged students	29,108	18,389	63.2
Migratory students	15	N<10	
Male	26,878	19,209	71.5
Female	25,438	19,201	75.5
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	51,440	38,332	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	152	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	791	702	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	18,945	11,608	61.3
Hispanic	2,430	1,748	71.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,829	23,939	83.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,319	2,166	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,046	1,395	68.2
Economically disadvantaged students	27,771	17,918	64.5
Migratory students	10	N<10	
Male	26,347	19,002	72.1
Female	25,083	19,324	77.0
Comments:			

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	51,397	38,503	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	153	76.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	771	674	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,944	11,791	62.2
Hispanic	2,405	1,700	70.7
White, non-Hispanic	28,837	23,999	83.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,324	2,126	33.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,992	1,288	64.7
Economically disadvantaged students	27,753	17,985	64.8
Migratory students	10	N<10	
Male	26,321	18,275	69.4
Female	25,066	20,221	80.7
Comments:			

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	25,664	17,461	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	74	67.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	403	342	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	9,468	4,783	50.5
Hispanic	1,205	752	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	14,358	11,426	79.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,152	916	29.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,021	554	54.3
Economically disadvantaged students	13,925	7,794	56.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	13,093	8,839	67.5
Female	12,566	8,620	68.6
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	51,766	31,764	61.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	111	61.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	818	691	84.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,243	8,741	43.2
Hispanic	2,194	1,213	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,115	20,850	74.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,150	1,317	21.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,426	647	45.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,716	12,165	47.3
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	26,160	15,832	60.5
Female	25,601	15,930	62.2
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	51,759	33,681	65.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	118	64.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	803	639	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,248	9,896	48.9
Hispanic	2,168	1,219	56.2
White, non-Hispanic	28,146	21,641	76.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,155	1,274	20.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,380	533	38.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,716	13,069	50.8
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	26,165	15,667	59.9
Female	25,589	18,013	70.4
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0

Comments: # Students W/Score # Scoring Proficient % Scoring Proficient

All Students 47,224 11,076 23.5
 Am Ind/Als Ntv 48 11 22.9
 Asian/Pac. Isl. 629 316 50.2
 Black 18,194 1,699 9.3
 Hispanic 1,863 340 18.3
 White 25,924 8,555 33.0
 CWD 4,376 145 3.3
 LEP 1,409 229 16.3
 Econ. Disadv. 23,102 2,674 11.6
 Migrant I/S I/S I/S
 Male 23,384 5,935 25.4
 Female 23,845 5,139 21.6

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	1,123	603	53.7
Districts	86	3	3.5
Comments: The total number of districts is 88.			

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	514	346	67.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	506	338	66.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	8	8	100.0
Comments: The number of Title I schools that made AYP has been verified.			

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
88	3	3.4
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	8
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
Comments: Blanks represent zero.	

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)	6
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	84
Comments: Blanks represent zero.	

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.

District oversight committee; external consultants; school data team with instructional coaches; extended school year with master teachers and district oversight; professional learning communities with district monitoring; associate superintendent oversight with continuation of new curriculum; district oversight with an academic audit process; single gender program with professional learning teams; quarterly evaluation of programs by district administration; Teacher Advancement Program; Palmetto Priority Schools initiative; instructional coaches; lateral governance with a new curriculum; Corrective Reading, Imagine It! Reading; problem-based learning/School Within-A-School; science, math, and literacy coaches; Classroom Without Walls.

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.

The Title I Team in the Office of Federal and State Accountability offer ongoing support to districts identified for improvement or corrective action. This support is provided via assigned Education Associates for each district and one Education Associate assigned to assist districts in corrective action. There were three Elluminate sessions (virtual meetings) held for districts in improvement or corrective action. Each meeting was approximately two hours in length and focused on support offered through the Statewide System of Support, the planning process for districts newly identified for improvement, and the process for the SCDE to impose a corrective action in districts identified as in corrective action. In addition, the Title I Team sponsored a one-day training for districts identified as in corrective action. The training was facilitated by the SEDL and focused on the Professional Teaching and Learning Cycle.

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	15
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	13
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	2
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	4	4
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	12/31/10
---	----------

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	72,101	72,216
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	52,166	51,079
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	72.4	70.7
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	72,045	72,126
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	55,952	55,434
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	77.7	76.9
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	156
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	9

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

Comments:

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<p>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
1		24	11	3	A	
2		34	13	7	A	
3		0	0	0		
4		4	0	1	A	
5	Inclusion teachers; afterschool program; extended day program; summer school program; intervention teachers; reading recovery teacher; instructional coaches; Read for the Record	31	9	8	C	
6 = Combo 1		51	23	14	A	
7 = Combo 2		26	6	8	A	
8 = Combo 3		19	4	5	A	

Comments:

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C =Improved parental involvement

D =Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Title I team sponsored a two-day "Best Practices in Title I Schools Conference" for Title I schools. There were over 400 teachers and administrators in Title I schools present. Participants had 50 concurrent sessions to choose from over the two-day period. Most of the sessions were conducted by teams of Title I schools.

During the South Carolina Association of State Title I Administrators spring conference, the Title I Distinguished Schools and the semi-finalists in each category presented sessions about best practices used in their schools.

The SIF project coordinator provided technical assistance to each school and noted best practices in order to share this information with all other schools.

Twenty-four of the schools in the SIF program are involved a school level partnership with other schools to share information, professional development, and technical assistance. These partnerships were chosen from one of three categories: (1) mentoring schools (6 schools), (2) grade level schools (7 schools), and (3) feeder schools (11 schools).

Of the twenty-four SIF schools in these partnerships, sixteen made AYP. Schools shared strategies with other schools and with their partner schools. Model classrooms were created at some school sites.

All schools participated in SEA technical assistance throughout the year. These sessions included literacy, early reading strategies, PALS math, Strategic Instruction Model (SIM®) RtI, formative assessment, instruction for students with special needs, principal effectiveness, leadership roles, and grants management.

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: 95% of the total 4% were distributed directly to LEAs for school improvement efforts and the remaining funds were used for a statewide system of support.

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.

State level funds were used to evaluate and monitor the progress of funded applicants. The SCDE was involved in developing and delivering comprehensive leadership and technical assistance. The SCDE used the SEA-retained funds to:

- provide oversight of fund allocation and program management for subgrantees, monitor school improvement efforts, and verify fidelity of implementation at site level
- coordinate and provide consulting and professional development to subgrantee schools and districts through in-house and an external service providers
- evaluate (with evaluator) the effectiveness of program implementation
- contract with external service providers to provide onsite assistance
- support/offset administrative, training, and technical assistance costs.

The project director spent significant time in each school providing technical assistance and professional development to meet each school's needs. All schools participated in SEA technical assistance throughout the year. These sessions included literacy, early reading strategies, PALS math, Strategic Instruction Model (SIM®) RtI, formative assessment, instruction for students with special needs, principal effectiveness, leadership roles, and grants management.

An external evaluator provided the evaluation of the SIF and monitored the progress of funded applicants by the examination of data, the implementation of rubrics and protocols, the onsite visits and classroom observations, and the bi-annual reports.

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.

Twenty schools identified as in restructuring and one school identified as in corrective action are part of the Palmetto Priority Schools initiative. Through this initiative, schools are assigned liaisons who make at least two to three on-site visits per week to support the schools improvement efforts. The South Carolina Department of Education works in collaboration with partners across the state to provide assistance to these schools. Each Palmetto Priority School is represented in the collaborative's leadership team by its principal, district superintendent, and school board chairperson. South Carolina Department of Education leadership team members include State Superintendent of Education Jim Rex, project director, the office of Special Projects staff, and the liaisons assigned to each school.

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	140,300
Applied to transfer	3,714
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,944
Comments:	

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	\$ 3,948,490

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	0

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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	83,347
Applied for supplemental educational services	18,866
Received supplemental educational services	12,359
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	\$ 17,302,771
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	211,322	205,832	97.4	5,490	2.6
All elementary classes	127,231	125,247	98.4	1,984	1.6
All secondary classes	84,091	80,585	95.8	3,506	4.2

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

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

South Carolina uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.
--

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	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	20.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	37.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

HQ special education teachers who are instructing students with disabilities out of area, such as HQ LD teaching EMD or HQ elementary teachers who are teaching special subjects, such as Spanish, art, or music to elementary students.
Percentage

	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)	34.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	28.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	38.0
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	24,934	24,057	96.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	40,368	39,819	98.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	15,398	14,024	91.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	29,606	28,843	97.4
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	92.8	63.6
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or eligible for Medicaid.	
Secondary schools	84.7	56.8
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or eligible for Medicaid.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
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"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<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	31,511
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.	31,267
Comments:	

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	25,080
Russian	866
Vietnamese	652
Chinese	486
Arabic	386

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	31,944
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	784
Total	32,728
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,608
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	8.2
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	31,637
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	784
Total	32,421
Comments:	
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.	6,903

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	9,191	37.2	5,176	21.00
Attained proficiency	2,589	8.2	316	1.00
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)
Not Applicable
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)
Not Applicable
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)
Not Applicable
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
1,354	238	1,592
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
1,584	1,511	95.4	73
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
1,584	1,526	96.3	58
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
807	742	91.9	65
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	43
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	40
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	43
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	43
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	40
# - 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)	1
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
# - 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</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
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?	<u>N</u>
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
4,693	95	1

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.	476
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	550

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.

While ESOL teachers cannot be paid using Title III funds per the October 2, 2008, Supplement Not Supplant Provision of Title III of the ESEA and there was a decrease in the number of ESOL teachers in SC by approximately 9 percent; students are primarily served by their mainstream teachers. Our research has shown a trend over time that professional development for mainstream teachers on how to appropriately accommodate and meet the needs of ELLs has significantly increased in SC. We have also recognized that this training has become more in depth and covers a period of several days or weeks and includes bringing in consultants and other experts from the field. Our research has shown that mainstream teachers are critical to the success of our LEP students; thus, we have been working for the last several years to increase the training provided to mainstream teachers for working with their ELLs.

* 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	67	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	63	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	57	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	52	
Other (Explain in comment box)	24	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	67	25,984
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	61	3,090
PD provided to principals	62	802
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	58	1,026
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	55	3,127
PD provided to community based organization personnel	29	568
Total	332	34,597

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/17/09	10/26/09	101
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.

The above date was the date by which the fastest LEAs returned their final budget reports and signed grant awards from their superintendent to the SEA after the SEA made the final allocation amounts available to all LEAs. Other LEAs submitted their budget items to the SCDE at various rates, some slower than others, and these were then processed as quickly as possible by the SEA. Please note that there are several other offices involved in processing the grant awards to LEAs including the General Counsel, Finance and the Superintendent's office, all of which must take action before Title III money is actually available for LEAs to expend. For 2010-11 this process is proceeding more quickly as a new electronic routing system in place has reduced the amount of time it takes to complete the routing process.

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	1

Comments: There were no schools designated as Persistently Dangerous for the 2009-2010 school year. The research associate responsible for EdFacts uploading submitted this file demonstrating zero occurrences, but it is not pre-populated in the CSPR.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	73.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	69.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	69.1
Hispanic	68.3
White, non-Hispanic	77.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	43.0
Limited English proficient	68.9
Economically disadvantaged	65.2
Migratory students	62.5
Male	69.3
Female	78.0
Comments: Data has been verified.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.7
Hispanic	4.0
White, non-Hispanic	3.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	<3
Limited English proficient	<3
Economically disadvantaged	4.5
Migratory students	<3
Male	3.9
Female	<3
Comments: Data has been verified. <3 for LEP is the actual dropout rate.	

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	70	70
LEAs with subgrants	16	16
Total	86	86
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)	122	446
K	357	680
1	316	719
2	323	704
3	306	720
4	287	689
5	261	650
6	274	551
7	271	447
8	235	375
9	229	439
10	175	311
11	172	258
12	227	276
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total		
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	298	1,290
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,523	4,044
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	267	1,300
Hotels/Motels	467	631
Total	3,555	7,265
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)	371
K	548
1	572
2	569
3	589
4	537
5	513
6	417
7	390
8	303
9	363
10	265
11	215
12	228
Ungraded	
Total	5,880
Comments: There were zero ungraded.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	326
Migratory children/youth	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	832
Limited English proficient students	179
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	16
Expedited evaluations	11
Staff professional development and awareness	16
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	16
Transportation	16
Early childhood programs	11
Assistance with participation in school programs	16
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	15
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	14
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	14
Coordination between schools and agencies	16
Counseling	12
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	14
Clothing to meet a school requirement	16
School supplies	16
Referral to other programs and services	16
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	16
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	4
School Selection	4
Transportation	5
School records	7
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

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	490	317
4	469	295
5	436	274
6	363	173
7	334	171
8	308	126
High School	243	181
Comments:		

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	490	261
4	469	274
5	435	260
6	366	139
7	332	142
8	307	109
High School	239	158
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	197
K	57
1	53
2	59
3	44
4	50
5	22
6	28
7	20
8	18
9	14
10	19
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	609
Total	1,201

Comments: Ungraded is zero.

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 08-09 Category 1 Count was 1,057. The 09-10 Category 1 count is 1,201. The increase in the Category I Count is owing to a greater number of OSY identified. Several initiatives contributed to this increase. Participation in the OSY Consortium provided direction and support for program effort to identify and serve more OSY present during spring preparation, high crop season, and fall harvest. Consortium funds provided opportunity for grant awards for three OSY programs in districts and supported two temporary recruiters at the state level. Three migrant summer programs in districts provided ID&R specific to OSY for instructional and support services to this population. There was no severe weather impact upon crops during this year, which supported additional personnel to perform farm work in peak crop season. The climate relative to immigration issues may have seemed to have been less intense than the previous year, which influences mobility issues for some workers.

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)	97
K	46
1	34
2	44
3	33
4	35
5	14
6	14
7	10
8	13
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	313
Total	667
Comments: Ungraded is zero.	

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 08-09 Category 2 Count was 634. The 09-10 Category 2 Count is 667. The increase was not greater than 10 percent; however, the slight increase is owing to similar factors as for the increase in Category 1 for this reporting year. Participation in the OSY Consortium provided direction and support for program effort to identify and serve more OSY present during the high crop season, which is the summer season in South Carolina. Consortium funds provided opportunity for grant awards to identify and serve OSY in districts and supported two temporary recruiters at the state level. The OSY programs provided instructional and support services to OSY, with emphasis on survival English, literacy, math literacy, knowledge of local culture and community services. The two temporary recruiters at the state level also scheduled and provided instructional lessons to OSY in camp areas, in addition to regular ID&R activity. As noted in the explanation for the Category 1 count, there was no severe weather impact upon crops during this year, which supported additional personnel to perform farm work in peak crop season. The climate surrounding immigration issues may have seemed to have been less intense than the previous year.

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.

To ensure accuracy and eliminate duplication in the child count process, the MIS2000 electronic data system for both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts is used for migrant program data management. The data were input from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) required by the South Carolina migrant program. The South Carolina COE is compliant with the National COE and was reviewed by the Office of Migrant Education, USED, prior to implementation. The data review process at the state level was ongoing throughout the reporting year, with thorough review of data presented on each hard copy, original, completed COE. The manual count with review of COE data served to verify the accuracy of the information put into the MIS2000 system by participating electronic sites in the districts and the state site. MIS2000 will continue in use for the next reporting year. Accuracy of data input for each COE will continue to be verified with an additional manual count and review of data for all COEs presented from all sources. Last year's child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 were generated by MIS2000 data system use, with a manual count and review of data for each COE presented from all sources. The state will continue to use the same systems (electronic and manual) to generate the 2010-2011 Child Count. The MIS2000 data system will continue in use. A manual count with review of data for each COE presented from all sources will be performed at the state level.

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.

Data that serves to verify the Category 1 and Category 2 counts were collected using the same procedures for the time period of 9/1/09-8/31/10. Migrant recruiters and school districts enrolling migrant students completed a COE documenting the student's name, gender, ethnicity, date and place of birth with verification, and name of parent or guardian. Additionally, the COE requires listing qualifying move and activity, qualifying arrival date and previous residence, along with information from any prior school enrollment. The COE provides line space for supporting information for temporary or seasonal work. The COE requires the address of residence within the specified school district, the date of enrollment in school and program in which the student participated. Schools in participating districts for summer programs provided data through completed COEs, MIS2000 data entry and school district enrollment data reports. Additionally, COE data were completed and input for all out-of-school youth (OSY) identified or identified and served by either district or state recruiters, and OSY grant programs. The identification and recruitment of migrant families, their children and OSY generated the data collected for this child count. The identification and recruitment process was ongoing throughout this child count period. District summer program recruiters were trained in ID&R procedures by the state. Two additional state recruiters were employed to assist the state migrant recruiter. Migrant recruiters visited migrant camps and quarters, local tiendas and migrant health service centers, contacted and visited schools, conferred with district migrant recruiters and used referrals from multiple state and community sources. The other referral and information sources may include all other school district programs such as adult education, and other grant programs such as Migrant Head Start, South Carolina Migrant Health Program, outreach organizations, communities of faith, crew chiefs, growers, other migrant workers and educational referrals from the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT). Data collection, input, and review were ongoing during the period of 9/1/09-8/31/10.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data were collected from the completed individual COE. Data generated from each completed COE were input into the MIS2000 system by six program sites and the state site. This data then became part of the state data collection within the MIS2000 system. The original hard copy COE was forwarded to the state for the data review and manual count that all COEs are given. The original hard copy COE data were individually reviewed and matched to the uploaded data to ensure accuracy. Two state migrant recruiters and an OSY grant program not having an MIS2000 site submitted all original, hard copy COEs to the state office for manual count, data review and input into the MIS2000 system. Each COE is coded in the system for type of service that determines child count category assignment and is reviewed for positive identification of eligibility and accuracy of service. Update of eligible migrant information for a COE or in MIS2000 is done on an individual basis. South Carolina does not use mass enrollment or mass withdrawal.

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.

Both Category1 and Category 2 Counts are made with the same procedures as described.

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.

All electronic and original, hard copy COE data were required to be provided to the state migrant education office. COE hard copy data not previously input and uploaded by participating program sites were input into the MIS2000 state database by state staff. The COE student data were organized by school district for regular school year enrollment or migrant summer program enrollment, then by grade. From this data input, lists of participants with pertinent, qualifying information were generated. The resultant data count for summer program service was checked against school district summer program enrollment and data reports. The OSY that were identified as eligible and/or eligible and received service were input with the local school district of residency. The MIS2000 consolidated database was used for the student information system for child count purposes at the state level. In addition, a manual file system of original, hard copy COEs was maintained, organized by school district. All COEs and participating districts' enrollment data were reviewed during October and November of 2010. Electronic data entered for all district program sites were examined for accuracy by review of supporting data on the COE's and school district enrollment data. Queries and reports were run on the MIS2000 system at the state level to ensure accuracy of data entered for the six program sites, grant award projects and additional OSY identified. Queries were run to filter out any student not meeting the required criteria of 3-21 years of age, within three years of a last qualifying move or resident at least one day for a qualifying activity. To prevent duplication, reports were run that identify students who have matching date of birth and last or first name. Duplicate student information was printed and reviewed, then the data were combined so that students were counted only once within the A-1 and A-2 child counts. Worklists from MSIX provided additional opportunity for verification. To verify accuracy of information provided, participating school districts provided original, hard copies of COEs. These were checked for completion, accuracy, duplication, qualifying activity, qualifying arrival date, residency within three years of a qualifying move, district residency, age eligibility (between 3-21 years of age), and any summer participation. Therefore, through these procedures, confirmation activity to ensure accuracy in the child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 was performed.

Only those migrant students and OSY fully documented as eligible, during the twelve-month period of September 1, 2009 to August 31, 2010, were included in the 2009-2010 Child Count. Since the MIS 2000 system was implemented in the fall of 2000, manual checks and direct review of all information were implemented annually to verify the accuracy of the data presented. Both original and electronic copies of COEs were thoroughly reviewed and checked.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Count is generated from the same procedures and software as Category 1.

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.

Training sessions were held throughout the year to assist district program directors, district recruiters and the state recruiters. Eligibility requirements were provided in written guidance to all involved in the recruiting process. Law, regulations and overall issues related to eligibility of migrant children, continued to be strongly addressed in state training. New district recruiters received training and support immediately upon notice to the state of district recruiter employment. Ongoing software support to school district sites was provided this year by MIS2000 support personnel, with technical support and a training workshop provided by the state office for new data entry personnel at participating sites. An annual training is held by the state for all district migrant program personnel prior to the summer program.

To ensure that each child in the child count was eligible for inclusion, the use of the SC COE is required statewide. In addition to available training and direct school district support, the state provided eligibility information and the required COE form on the Migrant Program Web page within the South Carolina Department of Education Web site. This ensured public availability of necessary information and documents. An Elluminate session (Webinar) on migrant child eligibility for Categorical Free Meal Services was provided statewide to all Title I Coordinators, with other school district personnel in attendance as invited by the Title I Coordinators. Training on the COE was a key part of the Webinar presentation. District personnel, district migrant recruiters or the state migrant recruiter conducted a personal interview with OSY or the responsible party for each child identified. Signatures were required for the interviewer, the parent or guardian, and the person certifying the eligibility of the child(ren). All hard copy COEs were reviewed by the state's migrant recruiter for accuracy in determining eligibility. Experienced district recruiters provided additional oversight for review of COEs completed by newly trained recruiters. Questioned eligibility was referred to the state level for final determination of eligibility. Site visits and monitoring of district programs provided further opportunity to review COE data or resolve eligibility questions. The annual re-interview process assisted in verification for accuracy of information received and entered on the COEs. Re-interviewing activity to assess COE information data for newly identified migrant children was performed by the state migrant recruiters. A random sample was determined for the re-interviewing activity.

The COEs were checked against the enrollment lists provided by the districts. COEs from other sources were reviewed, then input at the state site. Checks for duplication were ongoing. Additional steps to eliminate duplicates was the review of certain data elements and processing worklists from MSIX. Children with the same or similar names were verified by comparing all data elements, along with use of MSIX as a reference tool for any previous data history. Only eligible students and youths for the 2009-2010 reporting period were entered into the MIS2000 database for this child count period. A review team in the state office ensured that duplications and students no longer eligible were eliminated from the database. Any COE that was incomplete or showed error was returned to the school district immediately for clarification. If clarification or necessary information could not be provided, that COE was omitted from the child count report data and was maintained separately. Any COE resulting from duplication or ineligibility of the student was archived in a separate manual file for any necessary reference. Summer program participants received immediate review of COE data such that only eligible children were served.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The quality control re-interview process for this year was based on the Rolling Re-interview. The re-interview was performed before the identified children were enrolled in the summer program, and before any COE data were input into MIS2000. For small states with less than 1,000, it was recommended to re-interview at least 10% of those identified. This process was used for small state South Carolina. Additionally, several initial COE's completed by new recruiters in the districts were reviewed and re-interviewed to ensure that new recruiters were conducting interviews properly. Thus, additional re-interviews were performed outside of the official process. Each of the summer program sites was visited by state migrant recruiters for the re-interview process. Rolling Re-Interview: The 129 children were randomly selected throughout the state. Each of the summer program sites was visited by state migrant recruiters for the re-interview process. COEs from districts without a program were compiled as one district, using the same re-interview process. The goal of the re-interview process was to re-interview the original person identified as having been interviewed on the completed COE. The re-interview was structured not to simply verify information on the COE but to conduct a second interview, then compare the results. If discrepancies were found, effort was made to determine the actual facts at re-interview rather than visiting the family a third time. An additional goal was to conduct the re-interviews face to face with the person who signed the COE within the original interview. If the person wasn't available, contact by phone was attempted before the alternate was used. All districts with summer programs participated in Re-interview process. State recruiters visited LEAs and followed the process of random selection. COEs were shuffled and then every 10th child was selected to be re-interviewed (counting 10, 20, 30, 40, 3tc). Additionally, every 10th child was selected as alternate (counting 5, 15, 25, 35, etc). With increased focus on quality control and training, only two districts had discrepancy. The three children in the two districts that were found not eligible were disqualified and not served. Also, to ensure only eligible children were enrolled, additional review of COEs, training and support to this district was provided. The "others" listed on the chart were Re-interviews that were performed for COEs completed at the SEA level. In order to eliminate bias, the recruiter who originally completed the COE did not participate in the Re-interview.

2009-10 Re-Interview Results

District # Sampled # Re- # OK # DNQ Confidence

Interview Level

Aiken 15 15 13 2 87% Beaufort
34 16 16 - 100% Charleston 22
17 17 - 100% Clarendon 3 17 8
8 - 100% Colleton 14 13 13 -
100% Edgefield 4 4 4 100%
Spartanburg 2 11 11 10 1 91%
Others 12 12 12 - 100%
TOTAL 129 96 93 3 97%

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.

South Carolina does not merge data. All original COEs were provided to the state office. Each COE was reviewed for completion and accuracy. When the data were input electronically and uploaded to the MIS2000 software, the COE data were compared for completion and accuracy of input at the state level using the original COE as reference. All COEs supporting the reported data were either newly completed ones or updated ones, and were completed or updated as identification was made during this reporting year.

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.

All data information had comparison review of the original, hard copy COE data with that of electronic input. MIS2000 reports were run to eliminate duplicates by focusing on elements such as first name, last name, date of birth and varied spelling of names. Any possible duplicates have comparison information reviewed such as parent's name, place of birth, school history or other eligibility data. This is performed for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts. All features of Potential Duplicate Students in the MIS2000 software were utilized. Duplicates found were removed within these ongoing reports run throughout the reporting year. As noted in the other quality control section, using MSIX as a tool and reference, and resolving any worklists to eliminate potential duplicates has been of assistance.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The purpose of the re-interviewing process for quality control has been strongly emphasized to all recruiters and district personnel. Additional training and ongoing review for the critical elements of eligibility will continue to be the focus for improvement. The training in early spring for all district recruiters and follow up training for new district recruiters before the summer program begins is a central focus for the state ID&R training. Districts will again be strongly encouraged to employ the recruiter(s) earlier, so that state training and ongoing review may be accomplished more in advance of the season activity. Districts were also strongly encouraged to use their access to the state student data base of the district to verify any regular year enrollment, as another check for residence and qualifying arrival dates. SIX will continue as a reference tool for data history of eligible children and elimination of duplicates or erroneous information. Districts are also provided access to MSIX for this purpose.

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.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. The child count for this period is accurate. All child count procedures generated through law, regulation and guidance were implemented by the state, and are the basis for this determination.