

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Alabama Department of Education		
Address: 50 North Ripley Street Montgomery, AL 36104		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Brooke Blair		
Telephone: 334-242-8199		
Fax: 334-242-0496		
e-mail: bblair@alsde.edu		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Brooke H. Blair		
		_____ Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 4:41:16 PM
_____ Signature		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSEMENT 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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2012-13	2013-14	2015-16

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2013-14	2013-14	2015-16
Regular Assessments in High School	2013-14	2013-14	2015-16
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2015-16

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Revision fully explained

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

<p style="text-align: center;">State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2013-14	2013-14	2015-16
Regular Assessments in High School	2013-14	2013-14	2015-16
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2015-16

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

<p>Revisions fully described</p>

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 2011-12, 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)	10.00
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	60.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We have recalculated the percentages for 1.1.3.1 to include carryover funds from the prior year. The costs for development remains at 10% and the costs to administer assessments/carry out other activities has now changed to 30%. The remaining funds available under <i>ESEA</i> section 6111 during SY 2011-12, which account for 60%, were carried over to SY 2012-13. The inclusion of the carryover funds (60%) brings the total to the expected 100%.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	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	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	S	393,258	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	3,544	>=99
Asian	S	5,342	98
Black or African American	S	134,096	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	17,376	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S		
White	S	229,608	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,292	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	41,028	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	7,158	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	231,802	>=99
Migratory students	S	665	>=99
Male	S	200,827	>=99
Female	S	192,431	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian.			

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	23,088	56.30
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,020	34.20
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,920	9.60
Total	41,028	////////////////////
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Alabama only gives an alternative assessment base on alternate achievement standards. All other special education students are assessed using standard state achievement tests with or without accommodations provided.</p>		

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	S	393,811	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	3,547	>=99
Asian	S	5,259	>=99
Black or African American	S	134,352	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	17,327	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	230,028	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,298	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	41,134	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,960	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	232,243	>=99
Migratory students	S	665	>=99
Male	S	201,163	>=99
Female	S	192,648	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. English Language Learner assessment participants must be recorded as participating, but they receive no proficiency level. Therefore there is a discrepancy between the number tested and the number proficient.

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	338
--	-----

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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	23,583	57.30
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,631	33.10
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,920	9.50
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	6	0.00
Total	41,140	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference of 6 students is the LEP students < 12 months took ELP.		

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	S	164,968	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,517	>=99
Asian	S	2,156	98
Black or African American	S	56,606	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	6,666	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	96,895	>=99
Two or more races	S	1,128	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	16,819	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,241	96
Economically disadvantaged students	S	93,866	>=99
Migratory students	S	249	>=99
Male	S	83,881	>=99
Female	S	81,087	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The EDFacts partner support center verified all of our numbers for Economically Disadvantaged students were exact matches in both files. The EDFacts ticket number for is 186840.

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,413	61.90
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,761	28.30
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,645	9.80
Total	16,819	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Alabama only gives an alternative assessment base on alternate achievement standards. All other special education students are assessed using standard state achievement tests with or without accommodations provided.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	55,777	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	451	S	89
Asian	855	S	93
Black or African American	18,195	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	3,142	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	32,459	S	90
Two or more races	675	S	84
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,992	S	57
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,024	S	77
Economically disadvantaged students	34,369	S	80
Migratory students	116	S	87
Male	28,634	S	84
Female	27,143	S	86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category.			

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	55,797	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	451	S	93
Asian	834	S	93
Black or African American	18,217	S	82
Hispanic or Latino	3,122	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	32,496	S	92
Two or more races	677	S	88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,000	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,976	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	34,393	S	84
Migratory students	115	S	77
Male	28,650	S	85
Female	27,147	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Alabama only administers the Science assessment in grades 5, 7, 11.

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	56,247	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	502	S	87
Asian	760	S	95
Black or African American	19,062	S	78
Hispanic or Latino	2,819	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	32,529	S	89
Two or more races	575	S	81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,089	S	54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,228	S	73
Economically disadvantaged students	34,793	S	81
Migratory students	116	S	85
Male	28,816	S	83
Female	27,431	S	87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian.			

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	56,359	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	503	S	91
Asian	747	S	94
Black or African American	19,097	S	81
Hispanic or Latino	2,806	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	32,630	S	92
Two or more races	576	S	89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,103	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,192	S	63
Economically disadvantaged students	34,862	S	84
Migratory students	116	S	82
Male	28,883	S	85
Female	27,476	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Alabama only administers the Science assessment in grades 5, 7, 11.

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	58,133	S	91
American Indian or Alaska Native	466	S	95
Asian	811	S	97
Black or African American	19,885	S	86
Hispanic or Latino	2,823	S	90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,602	S	94
Two or more races	546	S	89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,377	S	64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,045	S	77
Economically disadvantaged students	35,658	S	88
Migratory students	104	S	89
Male	29,878	S	90
Female	28,255	S	93
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian.			

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	58,237	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	467	S	93
Asian	788	S	93
Black or African American	19,937	S	83
Hispanic or Latino	2,822	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,675	S	93
Two or more races	548	S	86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,403	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,005	S	58
Economically disadvantaged students	35,760	S	84
Migratory students	104	S	79
Male	29,937	S	86
Female	28,300	S	92
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian.			

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	57,999	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	465	S	88
Asian	810	S	91
Black or African American	19,849	S	66
Hispanic or Latino	2,819	S	75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,509	S	88
Two or more races	547	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,362	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,040	S	51
Economically disadvantaged students	35,568	S	73
Migratory students	104	S	81
Male	29,811	S	79
Female	28,188	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category.			

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	58,668	45,272	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	528	440	83
Asian	825	774	94
Black or African American	20,269	12,729	63
Hispanic or Latino	2,580	1,888	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,961	29,063	86
Two or more races	505	378	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,083	2,292	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	892	445	50
Economically disadvantaged students	35,406	24,465	69
Migratory students	101	70	69
Male	29,851	22,642	76
Female	28,817	22,630	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian.			

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	58,720	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	529	S	92
Asian	817	S	94
Black or African American	20,301	S	81
Hispanic or Latino	2,575	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,993	S	93
Two or more races	505	S	86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,110	S	49
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	871	S	57
Economically disadvantaged students	35,459	S	83
Migratory students	100	S	81
Male	29,894	S	85
Female	28,826	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. Scores for Black or African American and economically disadvantaged have 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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Alabama only administers the Science assessment in grades 5, 7, 11.

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	58,383	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	547	S	75
Asian	722	S	93
Black or African American	20,078	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	2,363	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,262	S	81
Two or more races	411	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,978	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	842	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	34,449	S	63
Migratory students	91	S	64
Male	29,778	S	69
Female	28,605	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category. All proficiency scores have 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	58,475	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	545	S	89
Asian	714	S	93
Black or African American	20,110	S	77
Hispanic or Latino	2,360	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,334	S	91
Two or more races	412	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,984	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	819	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	34,519	S	80
Migratory students	91	S	78
Male	29,830	S	82
Female	28,645	S	90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category. All proficiency scores have 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	58,078	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	543	S	76
Asian	721	S	90
Black or African American	19,974	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	2,359	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,078	S	84
Two or more races	403	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,925	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	840	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	34,220	S	67
Migratory students	91	S	58
Male	29,600	S	73
Female	28,478	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category.			

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	57,121	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	541	S	87
Asian	744	S	93
Black or African American	19,790	S	66
Hispanic or Latino	2,162	S	77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,482	S	86
Two or more races	402	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,969	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	766	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	33,023	S	71
Migratory students	83	S	77
Male	29,377	S	76
Female	27,744	S	81

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category. All proficiency scores have been verified.

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	57,246	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	544	S	88
Asian	734	S	88
Black or African American	19,845	S	68
Hispanic or Latino	2,153	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,568	S	86
Two or more races	402	S	79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,987	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	738	S	37
Economically disadvantaged students	33,118	S	71
Migratory students	85	S	82
Male	29,448	S	74
Female	27,798	S	85

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Alabama only administers the Science assessment in grades 5, 7, 11.

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	48,929	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	509	S	86
Asian	625	S	96
Black or African American	16,817	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	1,487	S	85
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	29,313	S	90
Two or more races	178	S	85
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,540	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	361	S	59
Economically disadvantaged students	24,104	S	78
Migratory students	54	S	82
Male	24,493	S	83
Female	24,436	S	87

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category. All proficiency scores have 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	48,977	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	508	S	86
Asian	625	S	88
Black or African American	16,845	S	74
Hispanic or Latino	1,489	S	75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	29,332	S	89
Two or more races	178	S	84
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,547	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	359	S	25
Economically disadvantaged students	24,132	S	75
Migratory students	54	S	67
Male	24,521	S	80
Female	24,456	S	86

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category. All proficiency scores have 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	48,891	S	95
American Indian or Alaska Native	509	S	97
Asian	625	S	97
Black or African American	16,783	S	90
Hispanic or Latino	1,488	S	93
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	29,308	S	98
Two or more races	178	S	92
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,532	S	74
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	361	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	24,078	S	92
Migratory students	54	S	87
Male	24,470	S	95
Female	24,421	S	95
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not report Pacific islander separate from Asian. The 20 percent increase in two or more races is due to the state policy to default all non-specified students to the two or more race category.			

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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,358	1,025	75.50
Districts	132	106	80.30

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	904	694	76.80
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	873	669	76.60
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	31	25	80.60

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
129	103	79.80

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	8
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	6
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	3
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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)	5
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Takeover the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	5
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other major restructuring of the school governance: 1. Central Office assumed the instructional decision-making role of the principal; contracted with a local School Improvement Specialist to assist; 2. Central Office assumed the instructional decision-making role of the principal; contracted for instructional leadership coaching for principal; 3. Restructured school from K-2 to K-5 (for 2 schools)
4. Increased instructional decision-making role of central office

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 State Support Team in Alabama was composed of Regional School Improvement Coaches and Peer Mentors. Peer Mentors are assigned to schools with greatest need. Their clients are the principal and school leadership teams. Regional School Improvement Coaches serve districts with schools identified as in improvement, corrective action, restructuring or beyond. The coaches' clients are the District School Improvement Leadership Team members and specifically the District School Improvement Coach. The State has identified a set of processes required to improve district capacity. These processes delivered to districts statewide include such things as: using data to drive achievement; coaching on classroom management, strategic teaching; preparing the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP); implementing the CIP; interventions for non-mastery; raising graduation rates with proves strategies; preparing for High Stakes Testing; and Planning for Change. This technical assistance is provided at least on a monthly basis throughout the school year and when high need is demonstrated, more frequently. Twenty-seven out of 27 systems in district improvement were served during the 2011- 2012 SY. Additionally, the state employed 4 coaches with expertise for working with English Learners. These coaches worked with districts who had not met AMAOs bringing specific technical assistance to districts to build English Learner capacity through the district School Improvement Specialist who then turned the training around to English Learner teachers assigned at either the district or school level. Professional development, open to all districts in the state including districts in improvement, was provided quarterly by the Regional School Improvement Coaches through School Assistance Meetings.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	1
Schools	6	6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete.	08/28/12
--	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2011-2012 SY, the Alabama State Department of Education, Federal Programs Section (SDE), began using the ALAStar System developed through a federal contract with Academic Development Institute (ADI). School leadership teams evaluated forty-seven indicators designed to identify components of total school reform. The use of ALAStar, provided the state with an in-depth look at the SIG schools' progress individually and collectively as required by SIG Final Requirements. This information was used to partially determine funding continuation.

Technical assistance (TA) was provided by the SDE in the following manner: each SIG District was assigned a District Grant Coach (DGC) whose job was to build school improvement capacity at the district level through specifically working with the District School Improvement Specialist (SIS) on school improvement "best practices." After Professional Development with the SIS, the coach then accompanied the SIS to a SIG school to observe and coach as the SIS turned the training around at the school level. The DGC was in each SIG district at least monthly and occasionally even weekly depending on need. Additionally, the SDE SIG team made onsite visits to each of the schools to do walk throughs and intensive classroom visits. Following the visits, the SDE SIG team met with the SIG district team who then provided follow-up to the school's (s') leadership team. Other professional development (PD) was provided to the SIG districts through the Southeast Comprehensive Center (SECC) around the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), a model to measure fidelity of program implementation. District leadership teams met quarterly for CBAM training. During the summer quarter, CBAM trainings were coupled with training on the Online Monitoring document developed by Sam Redding. Districts are currently involved in beginning the review process of year two to determine required indicators that were met and those that need attention during the third SIG SY. The SDE SIG team was also available daily for specific TA a district might have. These matters were handled primarily over the phone and through email but a member of the team would visit the site if such assistance was deemed necessary or was requested. It is the goal of the SDE to ensure that each SIG district and school receives as much individual technical assistance as required.

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 2011-12 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.

The State Support Team was composed of Regional School Improvement Coaches and Peer Mentors, who assisted schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring through the support of state allocated At-Risk Funds as well as Title I funds. Fifty percent of their salaries were allocated from At-Risk Funds and 50% from Title I funds. These support services included building capacity for school improvement processes at the district local education agency (LEA) level. Training was provided to central office personnel on: Preparing the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP); Preparing the Corrective Action or Restructuring Plan, Implementing school CIPs; Raising Graduation Rate strategies; including student mentoring and credit recovery; Interventions for Non-Mastery; Preparing for High Stakes Testing; and Planning for Change. Peer Mentor (master teachers) assignments were prioritized to insure that multiple year school improvement schools with the greatest needs received campus-level job-embedded training that included: using multiple measures of data and creating functional CIPs; using longitudinal data to identify achievement gaps in instructional programs; using pacing guides and identifying essential objectives for instruction; developing common assessments that are correlated to pacing guides; planning instruction for needs of non-mastery students; and employing CIPs for reflection and projection. In addition, sessions on school improvement strategies were held at the statewide MEGA Conference in Mobile this past summer. Some of the same topics were addressed in multiple sessions.

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	92,904
Applied to transfer	1,708
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,330
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,246,255

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	22

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:
 - o 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
 - o 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
 - o 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	39,567
Applied for supplemental educational services	7,748
Received supplemental educational services	5,174
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,160,689
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

	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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All Classes	162,057	155,377	95.90	6,680	4.12
All elementary classes	91,589	89,033	97.20	2,556	2.80
All secondary classes	70,468	66,344	94.10	4,124	5.90

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.

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

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

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

4/15/13 Comments: In our attempt to develop the data for this files we have found concerns with previous data collections based on variable definitions provided to us by the LEA and schools. There were two main items of concern that we have addressed in the attached data. The definitions of a Class were inconsistent between the schools and also varied year to year. Additionally, the determination of a Core Course were also variable in the same manner. To address the Class definition issue this we have assigned a State definition of a Class and applied that definition to all LEAs and schools. We have also addressed the "Core Course" definition by requiring the use of a State list of approved Core Courses.

The changes in the data from the last transmissions does not reflect these two static changes in these definitions and because we now have addressed these two issues in the data attached and we now have a single Statewide Student Management System the accuracy of data collected for these files has improved tremendously.

3/8/13 Comments: EDEN was not populated overnight, therefore the corrected data is not included in the table above. Per our conversation with Liz Fening on 3/8/13, we are emailing the corrected data and explanation to her this afternoon. 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.

--

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.

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	89.00
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	10.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	85.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	14.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

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.

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	19,840	19,173	96.60
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	27,240	26,719	98.10
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,847	12,553	90.70
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	22,451	21,667	96.50

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	86.00	51.30
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced meal eligibility	
Secondary schools	75.00	48.00
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced meal eligibility	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.
- c. *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.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Dual language	
<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 Response	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	19,468
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	18,044
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	15,520
Arabic	475
Korean	473
Chinese	400
Vietnamese	378

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 students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	17,679
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	17,679
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This population is very transient some students move prior to testing others move during testing. We make every effort to test all students and will continue to make every effort to test all students. The Total count was taken from a frozen date that all other State assessments use.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	4,246
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	24.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	16,410
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	16,410
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This population is very transient some students move prior to testing others move during testing. We make every effort to test all students and will continue to make every effort to test all students. The Total count was taken from a frozen date that all other State assessments use.	

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
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.	3,196

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

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 Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State 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 percent of students 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%).

Title III Results	Results	Results	Targets	Targets
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	10,842	82.00	7,549	46.00
Attained proficiency	3,905	23.80	2,297	14.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State does not offer Native Language Testing.	

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)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State does not offer Native Language Testing in Mathematics.

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 mathematics.

Language (s)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State does not offer Native Language Testing in Reading Language Arts.

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 mathematics.

Language (s)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State does not offer Native Language testing in Science.

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 (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,601	2,595	5,196

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,184	S	92	S

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,192	S	92	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
2,062	S	84	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The ARMT Plus in Science is only given in grades 5, 7, and 11.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	58
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	51
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	58
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	56
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	53
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	2
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	1

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Title III CONSORTIA
In order to receive a Title III Grant as a single district, LEAs must have sufficient numbers of ELs to generate a minimum grant of \$10,000. If an LEA is ineligible to receive Title III funds, they may form a consortium with other LEAs. To be a member of a consortium, the LEA must have less than the number of ELs required generating the minimum allocation of \$10,000. Each consortium must select an LEA to be the lead or fiscal agent; this responsibility is often rotated among the members. The fiscal agent is responsible for initiating meetings among consortium members and applying for Title III funds through the SDE's Electronic Grant Application Process (e-GAP). All districts receiving Title III funds must be included in the AMAO-A and AMAO-B determinations. Therefore, if an LEA within the consortium has less than the minimum N of 10 students, then the ACCESS scores of the LEA, as well as those of all other LEAs in that consortium, are aggregated to result in an AMAO determination for the consortia. For example, if LEA 1 has 5 students and LEA 2 has 60 students, then the consortium would have a total of 65 students whose ACCESS scores are included in the AMAO determination for the consortium as a whole. If on the other hand, each LEA in the consortium meets or exceeds the minimum N count of 10 students, then each LEA in the consortia would be reported individually for AMAO determinations. We have only one Consortium in our state.

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	Yes
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	__No__
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2,935	1,104	5

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 educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,419
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	204

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

- Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
- #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 and 1.6.4.)
- Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
- Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	57	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	42	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	53	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	48	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	54	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	295	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////////////////////
PD provided to content classroom teachers	57	15,273
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	49	1,974
PD provided to principals	54	681
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	52	468
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	50	1,996
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	285
Total	274	20,677

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other in Type of Professional Development Activity

1. SAMUEL I Interpreting ACCESS for ELLs Scores, Student Goal Setting, Language Objectives 49 # Subgrantees
2. SAMUEL II Myths and Realities regarding ELs, Differentiating Instruction, Strategies 48 # Subgrantees
3. SAMUEL III Building Background: One Piece at a Time 45 # Subgrantees
4. SAMUEL IV How Culture Affects Parents Involvement in Your School, Parental Involvement 44 # Subgrantees
5. Second Language Acquisition 36 # Subgrantees
6. Culture 35 # Subgrantees
7. Enrollment Procedures 38 # Subgrantees

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	10/01/11	27
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Verification Response 3/8/13 The State of Alabama fiscal year does not begin until October 1, at which time the funds are made available to the LEA's.</p> <p>The first distribution was made on October 27, 2011, which is 27 days after funds were made available to the LEA's. The fiscal year of the State of Alabama is October 1 through September 30. The # of Days/\$\$ Distribution is calculated from the time funds are available (October 1) and the first distribution to an LEA.</p>		

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.

Date required to make the allocations to the LEA is available before the funds are made available to LEA's. Consequently, it is a short time before they request reimbursement for expenditures. The first request for FY 2012 Title III funds was made in October 2011.

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. To be identified as a Persistently Dangerous School in Alabama, school must have three consecutive years of records indicating it has expelled 1% of the student population or five students (whichever is greater) for violent criminal offenses committed on school property during school hours or committed at school-sponsored activities.</p> <p>Offenses/Incidents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Homicide, robbery, assault in the first or second degrees, sexual battery (including rape) as defined by the Alabama Criminal Code. 2. Use of a handgun, firearm component, explosive, knife and other "unknown weapons" as defined by the Student Incident Report. 	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	93	93
LEAs with subgrants	39	39
Total	132	132
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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)	45	358
K	259	1,137
1	282	1,485
2	246	1,400
3	210	1,371
4	215	1,271
5	217	1,336
6	224	1,135
7	181	1,065
8	214	1,042
9	155	1,118
10	110	856
11	117	695
12	90	824
Ungraded	4	8
Total	2,569	15,101

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	128	1,755
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,983	11,970
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	319	669
Hotels/Motels	139	707
Total	2,569	15,101

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 Birth Through 2	68
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	395
K	1,131
1	1,499
2	1,434
3	1,383
4	1,304
5	1,339
6	1,123
7	1,119
8	1,102
9	1,108
10	839
11	684
12	819
Ungraded	9
Total	15,356
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. .	

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	352
Migratory children/youth	233
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,480
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	746
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. .	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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	1,155	945
4	1,070	870
5	1,113	924
6	1,071	869
7	968	734
8	919	635
High School	515	375

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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	1,149	914
4	1,068	858
5	1,108	968
6	1,062	702
7	967	544
8	912	614
High School	514	397

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	1,104	809
6		
7	946	586
8		
High School	514	463

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	404
K	234
1	233
2	190
3	150
4	154
5	152
6	131
7	122
8	126
9	118
10	84
11	75
12	78
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	68
Total	2,319
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comment necessary	

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.

No increase or decrease greater than 10%

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	136
K	56
1	57
2	45
3	37
4	38
5	28
6	19
7	11
8	6
9	10
10	21
11	10
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	474
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No response required	

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.

No increase or decrease greater than 10%

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Alabama used the MS2000 data system to compile and generate both the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. MIS2000 was also used for the last reporting period. Category 2 is NOT collected any differently from category 1.

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.

Alabama is divided into regions for the purpose of data collection and quality control. Each region has a coordinator who visits each program on a monthly or on an as needed basis as part of the state's quality control plan. If the district is utilizing paper COEs, the coordinator collects/reviews each new COE. If the COE is approved, it is entered into the MIS2000. Electronic COEs are submitted to a regional coordinator for review. The paper and electronic COEs are approved by the migrant committee.

During this same visit, any withdrawals and/or school transfers are collected. When a child listed on a COE withdraws from the local school system, the regional coordinator then enters the withdrawal date on the MIS2000 database. The regional coordinators contact the local MEP staff for updates regarding migrant students who have withdrawn or made a school transfer within the district. The regional coordinator ensures that all student information is updated and current in the MIS2000 data base.

The COE document upon completion, either electronically or paper, contains the following data:

School District Name: The school district name is entered at the top of the COE.

COE Identification Number: The COE ID # is generated by the MIS2000 system when the COE is entered electronically by the local recruiter(s) or by a regional coordinator if the COE is submitted on as a paper COE.

Family Data: Male Parent/Guardian and Female Parent/Guardian and current address and telephone number are entered.

Child Data: First, Middle Initial, Last Name, an MIS2000 assigned ID number (which stays with the student upon all enrollments in Alabama), Ethnicity, Gender, Date of Birth, Date of Birth Verification, Multiple Birth (Yes or No), Birthplace, School Name, Grade, Enroll Date, Enroll Type, and Interrupted Education (Yes or No)

Eligibility Data: The school district the child(ren)/family moved to and from, the qualifying arrival date and residency date of the children/family, information on whether the child moved with or to join the worker or on his/her own as an emancipated youth, the relationship of the child to the worker, checks to identify whether the worker came to obtain or seek, temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing employment, the name of the qualifying activity, and the reason the work is considered temporary.

Other Information: Information on the home language, residency date, and other workers and type work, and the number of children born after the move is collected.

Comments: Comments are entered to provide further information if there is a "to join" move, if the worker moved to obtain qualifying work, but did not obtain the work, if the work is for "personal subsistence, and if the work is considered "temporary."

Parent/Guardian Consent: The parent/guardian signs and dates the COE, after FERPA has been explained to him/her, authorizing the school district and the State Educational Agency to release, transfer, and/or receive the child's education and health records to/from other school districts, educational agencies, and other pertinent agencies. The relationship to the child is also listed.

Eligibility Data Certification: The recruiter signs the COE certifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible for MEP services based upon the information provided. The signature attests that "to the best of the recruiter's knowledge, the information is true, reliable, and valid. For paper COEs, the recruiter then submits the completed COE to the local MEP designee for a signature certifying the same statement as the recruiter. On the electronic COEs, the parent, recruiter, and designated reviewer sign.

Summer School/Intersession: The local MEP staffs provide a description of the summer program and the dates of the migrant summer programs. The local MEP staff submits a list of all students who attend the migrant summer program. A school history line is entered on the MIS2000 with the dates of summer attendance for each child who attends. The local MEP staffs also provide a list of the services the students receive during the summer programs. These services are entered on the MIS2000 data base.

? **Box 1:** Please identify when summer school/intersession enrollment information was collected for use in MIS2000, under the required data elements of the National COE, further details are needed as to what information is collected for the current address. Summer school enrollment information is collected at the beginning of the migrant summer programs. Any new migrant enrollees in the summer programs are added as necessary. Summer school enrollment information is collected from each system by the regional migrant coordinator. The regional migrant coordinator enrolls all eligible students with an enroll date in MIS2000. At the end of the summer program, the regional coordinator enters a withdrawal date in MIS2000 for all participating students. A MIS2000 category 2 reports can be compiled to indicate all migrant summer school participants. All data collection and entry into MIS2000 for summer sessions is complete within 2 weeks of each summer session completion. For the current address the actual physical address, including the complete name of the street or road where student resides is used. If a physical address is not available, identifying information such as trailer number, rural route, migrant camp, or landmarks (etc...) are included. If the physical address is different from the mailing address, the mailing address is added in the comment section of the COE or if additional information is necessary it can be placed on the 2nd

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 regional coordinators regularly enter and update all student data. The MIS2000 system technicians build reports which organize the data needed for annual reporting. The two reports used are: Table C-7 12 Month Count by District (Category 1) and Table C-7 Summer Count by District (Category 2). These are both unduplicated counts. The tables are run "by district" in order to have further checks for accuracy. The MIS2000 is used for migrant data entry in Alabama. There are regional migrant coordinators who enter migrant data for their assigned regions of the state and are the only persons who enter and update migrant data on the MIS2000 data system. The regional coordinators enter data weekly. The state of Alabama requires each school system to have "Employment/Agricultural Surveys" completed on new students who enter their systems. The local MEP recruiters for systems who have funded programs and the state recruiter for those systems without funded programs use these "Employment Survey" forms to find potential migrant students. The families are visited face-to-face to determine eligibility. If the family is eligible based on MEP guidelines, a COE is completed with the family and children information required on the COE.

Eligibility Data Verification and Certification: The recruiter completes the COE and signs the COE certifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible for MEP services based upon the information provided. The signature attests that "to the best of the recruiter's knowledge, the information is true, reliable, and valid." The recruiter checks the COE for completeness and then submits the completed COE to MIS2000 electronically or to the regional coordinator if using a paper copy. The paper COEs are signed by the local MEP designee and the approved electronic COEs are signed by the designated SDE reviewer. The state MEP committee checks the COEs for completeness and eligibility. If the COE is complete and accurate, then eligibility is approved. If the COE is completed on paper, the regional coordinator enters the COE into the MIS2000 system and the COE is returned to the local system for filing. If the COE is submitted electronically, the LEA can print a copy of the COE for filing. If the COE is not approved due to lack of completeness or eligibility questions or issues, it is returned to the system for more information or corrections. If the COE is not approved due to eligibility issues, it is returned to the local MEP with the reason. The MEP committee meets monthly and the paper COEs are returned to the regional/local recruiters following each monthly meeting. The LEA is notified if there are any problems with the COEs that are submitted electronically.

The yearly verification process to determine that the children/family are still in the area and in the school system combines a combination of the following methods: use of face-to-face visits with the family by the local migrant staff verifying that the student is still enrolled in school, and by use of school records, utilizing the state's student tracking system (INOW) used by all the schools which contains enrollment and withdrawal records.

Box 2: Please specify the queries and processes for the elimination of student duplicates. Please specify as to when the yearly verification takes place. MIS2000 has the capability to print a list of any duplicate migrant students. This date is checked during the regular school year during each semester. After verification, any duplicate students are merged in MIS2000. The MIS2000 provides a report for "potential duplicate students." The "potential duplicate students" can be filtered by the any of the following: matching DOB, close DOB, matching DOB + last or first name, matching DOB + last + first name, potentially adopted duplicates, same social security number (not available in our database), or Soundex match. The system also allows a filter for "only recent records," if needed. If students on the list of matching DOBs are found, the report provides a "y" if the students are multiple births. Once data is pulled for the Eden system a final check for duplicates is made.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 and 2 counts are collected and maintained in the same manner.

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.

Alabama uses Management Services for Education Data (MSEDD) for our data collection. The data system we use is called the MIS2000 space system. The purpose of MIS2000 is to collect all data relevant to the MEP in Alabama from the schools and districts that serve the students and to compile it into a single database at the state level so that unduplicated counts can be produced for the CSPR. MIS2000 has all data from all sites throughout the state. The system has a search procedure, the potential to duplicate reports, and the merge student procedure to work together to purge duplicate student records. A single unduplicated count for the state is produced from a database that itself should be free of duplicates after using the three tools mentioned above. Producing unduplicated counts for districts or regions requires that each student be assigned to a single district or region for purposes of compiling a count for each.

The MIS2000 system will determine the student's eligibility by using the following criteria: the child count will produce a number and list of students who have an enroll date, funding date, qualifying arrival date, or withdrawal date between the start date and end date desired. The yearly verification process to determine that the children/family is still in the area and in the school system combines the following methods: 1) use of face to face visits with the family by the local migrant staff and 2) verifying that the student is still enrolled in school by use of the school records, especially by checking the state student tracking system (INOW) which is used by all the schools in the state. The INOW contains enrollment and withdrawal records for all students in the state. The INOW and MIS2000 list of migrants are verified in the fall and in the spring to ensure that only eligible migrant students are coded as migrant on the INOW database.

The following is the procedure that MIS2000 uses to determine if a student is Category 1 or 2:

- 1.) Enroll Date, Funding Date, LQM Date (last qualifying move), Res Date (residency date), or Withdraw Date is between the Start Date and End Date (Student has activity during the date range.)
- 2.) LQM3 Date (last qualifying move date) is greater than the Start Date (Student's LQM was within 3 years of the Start Date.)
- 3.) Twenty Second Birthday is greater than the Start Date (Student turns 22 after the Start Date.)
- 4.) Third birthday is less than the End Date (Student turns 3 before the End Date.)

Please describe how children who were served during the summer/intersession are identified in the database system. Migrant children who are served during the summer programs have an enroll date and a withdrawal date in MIS2000 for the summer. Also, all migrant services are coded in MIS2000 at the end of the summer term.

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 State of Alabama's Category 2 data IS NOT collected differently from the Category 1 count

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District recruiters are trained by the state and then receive updated training on a regular basis. The local recruiter has the first responsibility to complete a COE accurately after determining that a family may be eligible. The district coordinator reviews the COE for completeness, and then it is submitted to the regional coordinator. If the district is utilizing paper COEs, the coordinator collects/reviews each new COE. If the COE is approved, it is entered into the MIS2000. Electronic COEs are submitted to a SDE designee for review. Official eligibility is decided by the State MEP Committee. If there are questions, more information is requested, and the COE is reviewed by the State Migrant Specialist in consultation with all regional coordinators. COEs submitted by the state recruiters are reviewed for approval at this time as well.

A random list of 150 migrant students is generated from MIS2000. The re-interviewer contacts the parent, emancipated youth, or guardian via home visit to conduct a re-interview verifying the information on the COE. They report their findings to the state director. Alabama's COE is a standard COE that is used state wide. Training is provided for local MEP recruiters annually at the state level and at the local level as needed, as new recruiters are hired. The state of Alabama requires that all recruiters receive training before beginning recruitment. The State of Alabama has adopted a recruitment tool entitled "The Recruiter's Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students." Each recruiter has a copy of the manual and has been trained on its contents. Any new recruiters are provided a copy of the manual and training on its use. Some of the topics covered at training sessions include the following: qualities of a good recruiter, Employment Surveys collection procedures and use, how to interview, filling out the COE, keeping records, determining priority for services, types of services that can be provided to the migrant students, recruiting safety, quality control/re-interviewing issues, and qualifying agricultural and fishing activities.

The recruiter identifies possible migrant students, completes a paper COE or electronic COE and obtains the parent/guardian signature. The recruiter signs the COE certifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible for MEP services based upon the information provided. The signature attests that "to the best of the recruiter's knowledge, the information is true, reliable, and valid. The recruiter then submits the completed paper COE to the district MEP designee for a signature certifying the same statement as the recruiter. Electronic COEs are submitted to the SDE designee. After the local MEP designee has signed and dated the paper COE, it is submitted for approval by the state MEP committee. If an electronic copy has been submitted, the SDE designee signs the COE. The COEs are brought before the State MEP Committee for final approval. The state recruiter, the regional migrant coordinators, and the state migrant director make up the approval committee. The state MEP committee checks the COE for completeness and eligibility. If the COE is approved, the regional coordinator enters the paper COE into the MIS2000 database and the COE is returned to the appropriate MEP personnel at the local level for filing. If the electronic COE is approved, the local MEP is notified and can print a copy for filing. The decision of the State MEP Committee is the final step in the progression of the COE. If the committee has a finding other than "approval," and the LEA does not agree with the decision, the LEA may follow the appeal process outlined in the Quality Control Plan.

Box 1: Describe the type of interview conducted by interviewers when establishing eligibility. Please address how recruitment efforts are evaluated and how monitoring is conducted. What type of training is provided to the records/data entry personnel? How are summer/intersession personnel instructed on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data? Face to face interviews were conducted with most of the migrant families. However if a family cannot be reached after 2 home visits an additional effort is then made to contact them either going to their work site or calling them on the phone. Recruiting efforts are evaluated on a monthly basis at meetings involving the regional migrant coordinators, the state recruiter, state coordinator and the state migrant director. The meetings provide an opportunity for discussions regarding any area of recruitment or the COE that is in need of training or an updating of our procedures. There are two state data entry persons (regional migrant coordinators). These two people have had extensive training on MIS2000 and also have seven years of experience with the state data entry program. Summer personnel are responsible for documenting migrant student enrollments and attendance. The information is collected by the regional migrant coordinators. The regional migrant coordinators and/or the state migrant coordinator or director visit the summer programs to verify the information.

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.

Last year (09-10) we re-interviewed 25 families out of 402 new COEs. Of those we only had one family not qualify. The year before (08-09) there were 337 COEs eligible for review and 25 families were re-interviewed. Again we only had one family not qualified. To ensure that eligible migrant students are correctly identified and recruited, the State of Alabama developed a quality control plan. Recruitment is conducted by trained recruiters. Before recruiters are allowed to recruit, they must receive training. The training consists of the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the recruitment of migrant students. The recruiter reviews the COE for accuracy before submitting. The COE is reviewed and signed by the local MEP designee. The completed COE is submitted to the Regional Coordinator. The COE is again checked for accuracy by the Regional Coordinator. All COEs are brought before the State Migrant Team for review and final approval or denial. Eligibility issues are discussed in full before determination of eligibility is made.

In 2010-11, the State utilized the OME's "Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing," for guidance in the re-interview process. The re-interviewers were trained on the guidelines for the re-interview process. The "systematic random" type of re-interview sampling was selected. There were 150 students generated randomly by city by MIS2000. There were 61 re-interviews conducted and the results indicated that only one child was found not eligible. This is a 98.4 % eligibility rate. The questions for the re-interview process were developed by the State Migrant Contract Team which consists of the regional migrant coordinators, the state migrant recruiter, and the state migrant coordinator. The team looked at several documents from other states as well as what law requires and developed our questionnaire utilizing these sources. Re-interviewing is usually done during the spring. An exception is made when a system has a large number of students enrolling during a short time such as during the summer. In several of our systems, the children come during the summer and leave before the first of the year; therefore, re-interviewing in these systems must be done during the summer months or there is no quality control for them. The RMC (regional migrant coordinator) for each area of the state conducts the re-interviews with the help of the state migrant recruiter who translates for the RMC. Using the randomly generated re-interview list, the re-interviewer contacted the parent, emancipated youth, guardian, or other member of the household to conduct a re-interview verifying the information on the original COE. The re-interviewer explained the purpose of the interview and completed the re-interview form. After the re-interviews are completed, the SDE Migrant Team looks at the results and makes the final decisions as to the eligibility of the students. The results are filed in the office of the RMC and a report is sent to the state coordinator. If a student is found to be ineligible, the LEA is notified and has the right to appeal the decision of the committee. The appeal must be in writing to the Alabama State Migrant Coordinator within 30 days of notification. If there is no appeal, the ineligible students(s) are removed from MIS2000 and the migrant rosters.

Box 2: According to the 2010-2011 CSPR reporting period, the 2011-2012 reporting period was identified as the year independent re-interviews would occur. In the preliminary report for the 2011-2012 reporting period, there is a lack of data and information for the re-interview process, independent or not. Please submit all the data for the 2011-2012 reporting period re-interviews. The 11-12 year was originally identified as the year that Alabama would use independent interviewers. However our political climate changed with the passage of our immigration legislation. Many families were reluctant to identify themselves as migrant to staff they were familiar with much less a group of people that they did not recognize or know. After discussion with OME it was decided that Alabama could put off the independent re-interviewing while this political climate was intense. Re-interviewing did take place. We conducted them as we have done adhering to all our policies and procedures. The state migrant coordinator and state director participated along with the regional coordinators wherever possible. A list of 150 students was generated randomly by MS2000. There were 69 interviews conducted and the results indicated that only one child was found not eligible. That is 99.31% eligibility rate.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Regional Migrant Coordinators are responsible for the accuracy of the data entered. The MIS2000 provides "Snap Reports" to check for accuracy of data entered. The coordinators check the MIS2000 reports as data is entered on a report to check for accuracy of data entry. Some of the reports checked on MIS2000 include the following: District Verifications which list each student in each system, End of Eligibility reports to determine when a student is no longer eligible for the migrant program, Verifying COE data to check for accuracy of COE information entered, Supplemental Services list to indicate which students are receiving services, Student Performance reports to check for accuracy of LEP status, testing information, special education, graduation status, dropout status, Immunization reports to determine which students do not have immunization information on the database, and Priority for Service reports to print list of Priority I and II students. The coordinators check the MIS2000 reports as data is entered to check for accuracy. Some reports are printed monthly, others by school terms as needed. The Regional Migrant Coordinators (RMC) prints a District Verification of eligible students for the beginning of the school year, at the beginning of term 2, and at the beginning of the summer. The District Verification is checked to ensure that there are no student is on the list whose eligibility has ended before each of the three terms. The end of eligibility can be verified by printing an End of Eligibility Report from MIS2000. Also, migrant students are withdrawn on MIS2000 when they reach the age of 22. The MIS2000 has a "red" date on the school history tab indicating end of eligibility which assists with data entry and withdrawals. As the RMC visits the district staff on a monthly basis, information is collected on any migrant students who have withdrawn from the system utilizing the state's student tracking system (INOW). Regional migrant coordinators provide a list of eligible students to the

local staff at the beginning of the school year. The local staff assists with verifying that the students are still in the district and that they are listed in the correct grade levels and at the correct schools. The RMC will utilize the MIS2000 District Verification of eligible students and the INOW list of students who are enrolled in school at the 40 day SDE count and again before testing in the spring to ensure that only students who are eligible are listed on the MIS2000 District Verification and on the INOW. The yearly verification process to determine that the children/family is still in the area and in the school system combines the following methods: 1) Use of face-to-face visits with the family by the local migrant staff and verifying that the student is still enrolled in school by the use of school records, especially by checking the state student tracking system (INOW) which is used by all the schools in the state. The INOW system contains enrollment and withdrawal records for all students in the state. The INOW and MIS2000 list of migrant students is verified in the fall and in the spring to ensure that only eligible migrant students are coded as migrant on the INOW database.

Box 3: Please supply further details to clarify how COEs are checked by staff to ensure the accuracy of the child count data that are inputted and updated. COEs are checked for accuracy by each recruiter. The COEs submitted on the tablets are uploaded to the data entry person (regional migrant coordinator) for another check for accuracy. Paper COEs are checked for accuracy by each recruiter and then by the local designated reviewer. The paper COEs are submitted to the regional migrant coordinator who also checks for accuracy before entry into MIS2000. The COEs are discussed at the monthly meetings with the regional migrant coordinators, the state recruiter, and the state migrant director. If errors are detected, the regional migrant coordinator discusses the error(s) with the local recruiter.

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.

Alabama runs reports "by district and unduplicated" to look at individual sites to uncover any irregularities. We verify the criteria used in building the reports which give us our child counts. Discrepancies in the reports are corrected if and when errors are found. For example, if a date of birth is wrong, it is corrected on the MIS2000 database. If a grade level is wrong, it is corrected on the MIS2000 database. Sometimes these errors are found and corrections are made after a report is submitted. All efforts are made to enter the data correctly. For example, a report can be generated on MIS2000 to indicate the End of Eligibility so that students can be withdrawn appropriately when the EOE occurs. Also, there is a report to indicate which students turn age 22; so that they can be withdrawn on the day he/she turns age 22. For the purposes of checking the data for and running of the Child Count 1 and 2 reports to be reported to ED, that person would be the State Department of Education Migrant Coordinator. For the running of reports on a daily basis for the purpose of day to day monitoring of the student data base would be the Regional Migrant Coordinators.

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 State of Alabama already has in place a series of steps for reviewing new COEs and re-interviewing families which have been recently recruited. There is a committee established (made up of regional coordinators, one state recruiter, and the State Migrant Specialist) to review difficult eligibility issues and either approve or deny any COE's in question. This gives support to our local recruiters. We also plan to conduct further state-wide random re-interviewing.

Box 5: Improvements must be identified once the independent re-interviews are reported. Once the independent re-interviewing reports have been submitted and analyzed, Alabama will address any problem areas to ensure improvements.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alabama is confident that the child counts are accurate. We trust that the processes and checks we have in place and have described above are accurate to the best of our ability.