

# **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**

**ARIZONA**



**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: Arizona Department of Education	
Address: 1535 West Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Richard Valdivia	
Telephone: (602) 542-3270	
Fax: (602) 542-3050	
e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Richard Valdivia	
_____	Friday, March 8, 2013, 4:57:10 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 ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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.

Academic Content Standards	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
	See below	See below	See below

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

Science Academic Content Standards Adoption summer 2013 Full implementation by 2016-17  Arizona is one of 26 lead states in the development of the Next Generation Science Standards that are based on the framework for K-12 Science education developed by National Academy of Science. The anticipated completion of the standards is spring 2013 and state board adoption summer 2013 with a 2 to 3 year implementation timeframe to full implementation in 2016-2017.
--

**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	2015	2015	2017 (?)
Regular Assessments in High School	2015	2015	2017 (?)
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA		
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2015	2015	2018 (?)

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>We are members of PARCC and NCSC and are following their assessment development timeline which has standard setting and achievement level determinations being made summer of 2015 after the first operational PARCC and NCSC assessments.</p> <p>Performance level discriptors are being developed for both PARCC and NCSC by content and grade level which will be used for assessment development and standard setting.</p>
---

**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;"><u>State has revised or changed</u></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	2014-2015	2014-2015	2017 (?)
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2017 (?)
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2018 (?)

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

As a member of the PARCC and NCSC Consortia, Arizona will administer those assessment systems for English Language Arts and mathematics 2014-2015. Summer of 2015, achievement standards will be adopted by the consortia and then presented to the State Board of Education for adoption in Arizona.

### 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)	45.00
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	55.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

#### 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)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	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
<b>Comments:</b> 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	573,858	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	28,303	>=99
Asian	S	17,912	>=99
Black or African American	S	31,582	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	245,049	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	242,379	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	72,066	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	28,181	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	307,121	>=99
Migratory students	S	2,684	>=99
Male	S	292,751	>=99
Female	S	281,107	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	32,317	44.80
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	33,363	46.30
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,386	8.90
Total	72,066	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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	574,430	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	28,350	>=99
Asian	S	17,931	>=99
Black or African American	S	31,634	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	245,264	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	242,617	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	72,175	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	28,239	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	307,603	>=99
Migratory students	S	2,686	>=99
Male	S	293,127	>=99
Female	S	281,303	>=99

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

**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	
--	--

**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	36,839	51.00
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,948	40.10
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,388	8.90
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	72,175	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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	237,478	97
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	11,633	96
Asian	S	7,546	98
Black or African American	S	13,417	96
Hispanic or Latino	S	99,350	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	102,166	98
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	28,220	95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	10,136	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	121,340	97
Migratory students	S	1,126	97
Male	S	120,574	97
Female	S	116,904	97

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

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

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	14,146	50.10
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,445	40.60
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,629	9.30
Total	28,220	////////////////////////////////////

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

### 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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	83,768	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,113	S	49
Asian	2,625	S	85
Black or African American	4,382	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	36,450	S	61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,778	S	80
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,129	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,160	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	47,325	S	61
Migratory students	379	S	53
Male	42,868	S	69
Female	40,900	S	70

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	83,773	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,115	S	55
Asian	2,625	S	87
Black or African American	4,381	S	68
Hispanic or Latino	36,454	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,779	S	86
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,131	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,161	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	47,327	S	67
Migratory students	379	S	54
Male	42,872	S	71
Female	40,901	S	79

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Student Academic Achievement in Science is reported for grade 4, 8, and High School only.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	82,805	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,057	S	44
Asian	2,570	S	83
Black or African American	4,494	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	36,226	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,161	S	77
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,379	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,518	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	46,587	S	57
Migratory students	368	S	50
Male	42,288	S	65
Female	40,517	S	68

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	82,815	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,059	S	55
Asian	2,570	S	87
Black or African American	4,493	S	67
Hispanic or Latino	36,230	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,166	S	86
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,379	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,520	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	46,593	S	67
Migratory students	369	S	55
Male	42,297	S	72
Female	40,518	S	79

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	82,747	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,053	S	37
Asian	2,568	S	78
Black or African American	4,489	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	36,191	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,150	S	80
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,352	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,516	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	46,546	S	51
Migratory students	372	S	32
Male	42,275	S	63
Female	40,472	S	63

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

**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	83,277	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,976	S	41
Asian	2,686	S	82
Black or African American	4,421	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	36,340	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,551	S	75
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,254	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,530	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	46,373	S	54
Migratory students	386	S	48
Male	42,636	S	62
Female	40,641	S	64

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

**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	83,274	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,971	S	59
Asian	2,686	S	87
Black or African American	4,418	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	36,341	S	72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,554	S	88
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,249	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,528	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	46,379	S	71
Migratory students	386	S	58
Male	42,631	S	74
Female	40,643	S	82

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

## 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

S

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			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Student Academic Achievement in Science is reported for grade 4, 8, and High School only.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	82,925	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,057	S	38
Asian	2,527	S	80
Black or African American	4,636	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	35,481	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,980	S	72
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,764	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,385	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	45,264	S	51
Migratory students	373	S	48
Male	42,238	S	59
Female	40,687	S	63

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	82,967	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,056	S	64
Asian	2,527	S	89
Black or African American	4,652	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	35,503	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,985	S	89
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,763	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,384	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	45,283	S	73
Migratory students	373	S	63
Male	42,261	S	76
Female	40,706	S	84

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

## 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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Student Academic Achievement in Science is reported for grade 4, 8, and High School only.			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	82,386	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,276	S	38
Asian	2,494	S	82
Black or African American	4,470	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	35,105	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,787	S	75
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,930	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,759	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	44,153	S	52
Migratory students	400	S	37
Male	42,227	S	61
Female	40,159	S	64

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	82,412	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,278	S	68
Asian	2,494	S	91
Black or African American	4,470	S	78
Hispanic or Latino	35,120	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,796	S	91
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,939	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,759	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	44,173	S	78
Migratory students	400	S	64
Male	42,244	S	80
Female	40,168	S	88

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

## 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Student Academic Achievement in Science is reported for grade 4, 8, and High School only.			

**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	80,827	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,056	S	36
Asian	2,446	S	78
Black or African American	4,711	S	43
Hispanic or Latino	34,041	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,467	S	69
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,689	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,395	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	42,481	S	46
Migratory students	402	S	39
Male	41,266	S	56
Female	39,561	S	58

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

**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	80,830	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,057	S	50
Asian	2,447	S	83
Black or African American	4,711	S	63
Hispanic or Latino	34,039	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,470	S	83
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,691	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,395	S	10
Economically disadvantaged students	42,479	S	63
Migratory students	401	S	56
Male	41,270	S	67
Female	39,560	S	77

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	80,880	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,063	S	43
Asian	2,447	S	82
Black or African American	4,715	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	34,062	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,490	S	82
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,704	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,392	S	10
Economically disadvantaged students	42,510	S	57
Migratory students	406	S	47
Male	41,310	S	68
Female	39,570	S	68

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

**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	77,870	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,768	S	39
Asian	2,564	S	79
Black or African American	4,468	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	31,406	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,655	S	73
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,921	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,434	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	34,938	S	48
Migratory students	376	S	37
Male	39,228	S	59
Female	38,642	S	61

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

**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	78,359	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,814	S	63
Asian	2,582	S	85
Black or African American	4,509	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	31,577	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	34,867	S	89
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,023	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,492	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	35,369	S	72
Migratory students	378	S	59
Male	39,552	S	77
Female	38,807	S	83

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,851	S	50
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,517	S	26
Asian	2,531	S	68
Black or African American	4,213	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	29,097	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	33,526	S	64
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,164	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,228	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	32,284	S	35
Migratory students	348	S	19
Male	36,989	S	49
Female	36,862	S	50

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been reported using five race / ethnicity categories as specified in the Arizona Dept. of Education Accountability Workbook.

## 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	2,253		
Districts	663		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not Applicable due to the Arizona ESEA Waiver.			

### 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	1,242		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	936		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	305		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not Applicable due to the Arizona ESEA Waiver.			

### 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
422		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not Applicable due to the Arizona ESEA Waiver.		

**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*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	12
Extension of the school year or school day	5
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	10
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	7
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
<b>Comments:</b> 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*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	27
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

1. Implementation of a systemic Response to Intervention (R t I) model, an academic intervention designed to provide early, effective Interventions to children who are having difficulty learning. Response to intervention models are used to implement curriculum and instruction that includes a multi-tiered instructional support, research based assessment system, data-based decisions, and professional development. In implementing the R t I model, schools focus on building systems that increase student achievement for all students.
2. Implementation of turnaround principals/school leaders who are given the necessary decision-making authority, as well as the necessary budget and staffing, to impact instructional programs with the focus on improved student achievement. In these situations, the principals are given the capacity to raise the professional expectations of staff and focus on data-driven instructional practices.
3. Implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) focusing on learning rather than on teaching, working collaboratively, and holding principals, teachers, and students accountable for results. In the process of implementation, schools revise master schedules to create scientifically-based, job-embedded professional development, and other professional collaboration opportunities. Schools reorganize themselves to integrate two concepts: professionalism and community. The characteristics of the PLCs in the restructuring schools include collective team work in which leadership and responsibility for student learning are extensively shared, a focus on reflective inquiry, emphasis on improving student learning, and shared values and norms.

**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.

LEAs in Improvement Status, including Corrective Action, receive the following support:

**Technical Assistance**

Identification of specific criterion for LEA Improvement status. Face to face meetings, phone calls and email on an as-needed basis. Arizona uses an electronic improvement plan system known as the Arizona Local Education Agency Tracker (ALEAT). LEAs are required to submit their improvement plans there. These plans are reviewed and goals are approved when they meet with our requirements.

**Professional Development**

LEAs are directed to other units when appropriate including, but not limited to: Special Education, English Language Learners, Rtl, Aspiring and New Principals, K12 Literacy. The school Improvement unit also provides quarterly professional development based on the needs of schools and districts that are free and open to all.

**Progress and Compliance Monitoring**

All LEA improvement plans are reviewed by a team of Title I and School Improvement specialists. The ALEAT system allows for districts to indicate their progress on action steps within the plan. These are reviewed and commented on when necessary. All Corrective Action LEAs are required to submit a document detailing specific Corrective Action implementation.

**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	48
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	7
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> 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		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not Applicable due to the Arizona ESEA Waiver.		

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

**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.

Funds were used for School Improvement and Intervention (SII) staff salaries and to cover costs of the technical assistance provided to the LEA and school leadership teams with one or more schools designated as "persistently lowest achieving." SII staff included Education Program Specialists, 4 Directors, and a Deputy Associate Superintendent. The work of the staff focused on technical assistance and monitoring and evaluating implementation of school improvement activities.

**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

The majority of technical assistance was focused on supporting cohort one and cohort two. SII staff revised the monitoring tool as well as the School Improvement Grant application. Technical assistance was provided through forums, webinars, onsite visits, emails and phone calls. Staff made regular onsite visits to the LEAs and/or schools on a bi-weekly or monthly basis throughout the year. SII staff were involved in a thorough evaluation of the SIG process.

**EVALUATION**

Review and evaluation of the schools incorporated several areas associated with the new school improvement plans. School plans were reviewed to ensure the plan completely addressed the identified needs from the self assessment on the Standards and Rubric for School Improvement. Specialists evaluated the CIPs to ensure the plans contained goals/strategies/action steps, funding resources, time lines and professional development activities that were aligned with identified needs. Once the CIP was approved, specialists spent the entire school year monitoring the implementation progress using on-site visits, electronic means and phone calls.

**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.

---

---

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	7,283
Applied to transfer	361
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	360
<b>Comments:</b> 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*.

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 473,259

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	30

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	30,329
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,075
Received supplemental educational services	4,588
<b>Comments:</b> 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*.

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,335,617
<b>Comments:</b> 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**

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	277,223	274,058	98.90	3,165	1.10
All elementary classes	176,042	174,495	99.10	1,547	0.90
All secondary classes	101,181	99,563	98.40	1,618	1.60

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.

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.

<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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	65.80
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	14.20
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	20.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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)	66.70
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	14.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.10
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	50,142	49,683	99.10
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	45,894	45,252	98.60
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	15,902	15,660	98.50
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	26,569	26,124	98.30

#### 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	78.00	20.10
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	74.10	19.90
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch	

**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.ncele.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncele.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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Heritage language	Navajo
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For those schools with a low incidence of LEP students, a mainstream class with an Individual Language Learner Plan (ILLP) is the type of program offered.

Please note: Arizona does not differentiate between types of bilingual programs offered.

**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	96,494
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Students Receiving Services</b>	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	85,614
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Language</b>	<b># LEP Students</b>
Spanish; Castilian	71,844
Arabic	1,202
Navajo; Navaho	1,025
Vietnamese	950
Somali	515

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	90,671
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,823
Total	96,494
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data are accurate as reported	

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

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	28,441
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	31.40
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	82,337
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,277
Total	85,614
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	4,878

**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:**

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and 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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	52,775	68.10	17,979	21.00
Attained proficiency	26,126	31.70	17,979	21.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				



**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
24,578	22,129	46,707

**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
31,027	S	49	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
31,061	S	66	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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
10,066	S	37	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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.)

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>	<b>#</b>
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	262
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	147
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	252
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	184
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	215
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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)	18
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	18
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	37

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. Each member of a consortium is counted as a distinct LEA for the purpose of determining AMAO performance.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>      </u> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Arizona met AMAO1 and AMAO2, but not AMAO3.	

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

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> 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
10,545	7,280	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.	5,929
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	872

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	124	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	103	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	123	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	103	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	86	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	34	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	121	11,457
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	135	5,694
PD provided to principals	109	950
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	96	753
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	94	1,639
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	365
Total	578	20,858

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Language Objectives/Rigor & Relevance/Scaffolding, SIOP, SEI Round II A,B,C, PD in explicit instruction of SEI 4 blocks of grammar, oral english/conversation and vocabulary, writing and reading, Writing and monitoring progress on ILLPs, Differentiating instruction to meet the needs of ELLS, Instructional Strategies for LEP students/PD w/concepts related to topic; ILLP process & implementation training, Teacher advancement program instructional rubric. Vocabulary strategies across the curriculum, Completion of ILLP paperwork, Understanding and implementation of individual language learner plans. ELP standards alignment to the ELA Common Core standards., ILLPs, ILLP training, Trainings included: Common Core, T4S, BT Training, Culture and Poverty, Process and Procedures of effective ILLP, SEI lesson planning, PD for SEI 45 and 15 hours courses. Documentation and compliance working with Grammar, vocabulary, word walls, common core standards, ELP standards, Building language through the common core, OELAS Proficiency : the key to success annual conference, smartboard training for ELL classrooms, Practical strategies to implement differentiation, Early Childhood-language needs and developmentally appropriate practices, AIMS: Strategies to improve student writing, AZELLA updates and training, Understanding and the implementation of ELP standards and academic contact standards for LEP students. Multisensory Grammar Training & Implementation for LEP students, Understanding and Implementing of writing & monitoring individual language learner Plans (ILLPs) Utilizing ELP standards for LEP students, Professional Development on writing ILLPs based on data. Different topics dealing with Dual Language, ILLP Implementation, ELD program, and ELD Implementation, Creating effective ILLPs, scheduling the required language development sessions. Project-Based learning implementing ELD strategies, cooperative learning strategies, alignment of curriculum with ELD standards. Strategies to increase engagement and other instructional methods to increase language. Home Language survey site based trainings, home language survey webinar, data team trainings ILLP instruction for teachers, common core implementation with LEP students.

**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
7/1/12	8/17/12	48
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Arizona Department of Education's (ADE) Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) collects from the LEAs, via upload from their selected student management system, student level data throughout the school year. LEAs have until June 30th, which is the end of the fiscal year, to submit and complete their student level data reporting responsibilities to the ADE.

Once the ADE has received all of the student level data from the LEAs, it usually takes approximately 30 to 45 calendar days for the ADE to validate all of the student level data statewide. By shortening this data validation turnaround time, the ADE would then be able to distribute these Title III funds more expediently.

**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>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

<b>LEAs</b>	<b>#</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting Data</b>
LEAs without subgrants	259	259
LEAs with subgrants	26	26
Total	285	285
<b>Comments:</b> 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)	137	126
K	1,675	1,159
1	1,554	1,062
2	1,426	1,035
3	1,332	981
4	1,218	933
5	1,195	907
6	1,152	883
7	1,069	927
8	1,042	912
9	2,169	938
10	1,215	884
11	1,358	784
12	2,100	1,002
Ungraded	2	1
Total	18,644	12,534

**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	4,010	2,579
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	13,158	8,994
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	614	292
Hotels/Motels	530	586
Total	18,312	12,451

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Below are the revised data.

Without Sub-Grant With Sub-Grant

Sheltered 4,083 2,596

Doubled-Up 13,397 9,054

Unsheltered 624 294

Hotels/Motels 540 590

Total 18,644 12,534

## 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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	127
K	1,130
1	1,037
2	1,012
3	970
4	918
5	900
6	868
7	913
8	896
9	927
10	879
11	781
12	1,003
Ungraded	1
Total	12,362
<b>Comments:</b> 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	285
Migratory children/youth	8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,257
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,309
<b>Comments:</b> 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	1,733	996
4	1,640	960
5	1,568	980
6	1,501	958
7	1,439	995
8	1,392	732
High School	1,359	811

**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	1,732	910
4	1,640	775
5	1,567	662
6	1,501	599
7	1,435	569
8	1,391	476
High School	1,319	474

**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	1,632	686
5		
6		
7		
8	1,392	647
High School	1,153	316

**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)	706
K	495
1	526
2	506
3	541
4	525
5	533
6	518
7	522
8	459
9	576
10	596
11	603
12	871
Ungraded	171
Out-of-school	41
Total	8,189
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

---

---

**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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	72
K	100
1	102
2	112
3	111
4	125
5	136
6	115
7	131
8	90
9	105
10	90
11	84
12	28
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	1,401
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

This past year, there has been an increase of students within the range of kindergarten and third grade. This aligns with school districts working on meeting the needs of primary Migrant students. By having Migrant students participate during the a summer/intersession MEP-funded project, it is showing the MEP LEAs determination in meeting the needs of migrant students and progress toward academic success. In addition, there is an increase of eighth and ninth graders on Category 2 Child Count. This accounts for LEAs with MEP projects working on assisting Migrant students in transitioning to high school. It is also a reflection on the higher emphasis toward increasing academic achievement.

**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 used COEstar for this reporting year and the last reporting year.

### 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.

What data were collected?  
The following data are collected relevant to the child count:  
(1) The COE  
(2) School or program enrollment including the school term, school year, enrollment and withdrawal date from the program  
(3) LEP assessment, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination data  
(4) Instructional and Supportive Services program data including type of program and funding source.

How was the child count data collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? Clerks/liaisons at each school site conduct a home visit with each migrant family who may be eligible for the Migrant Education Program. An interview is conducted, eligibility is determined, and the migrant clerk collects all information needed to report in COEStar. Information is collected on the student's classes of attendance, start date, end date, and days of attendance. The student must be present in order for that information to be entered into COEStar. The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by having the Statewide Services personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerks to input the information correctly. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered and provides technical assistance for them to enter into COEStar. Statewide Services is also responsible for conducting Data Verification with each LEA on a yearly basis. During the Data Verification, Statewide Services randomly selects students file to review. This review consists of checking the NCOE and the Arizona Attachment data against what is in the COEStar system as well as reviewing supporting documentation in the student file for all supplemental codes that are associated with the respective students. All Data Verifications are sent to the State MEP office for review and follow up, if necessary. The State MEP also conducts a Data Verification associated with the Cycle 4-On Site Monitoring. When were the data collected for use in the student information system? COEStar is an integrated component of our data collection system and data is collected during the entire year. Are there differences in how the State's Category 2 count was collected and maintained? The difference is in COEStar coding. Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are enrolled in a specific summer school line in COEStar and receive a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, students receive a unique "I" code enrollment type which corresponds with Intersession.

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.

COEStar is our primary filing system for student information, from the COE to the collection of services. COEStar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to provide the child count and additional reports for the Comprehensive State Performance Report. Student data is collected locally by the LEAs participating in the Migrant Education Program and entered into COEStar by the districts directly, if they have the capacity to do so, or by the staff from our data center at Statewide Services, if districts are unable to enter data directly. At the beginning of each school year, Migrant Clerks are responsible for checking with each school's registrar to determine if enrollment is the same. Regardless of enrollment status, it is the Clerk's responsibility to attempt to contact each Migrant family in the district. This is done by either telephone or home visit. Once contact has been made, the clerk re-interviews the parents/guardians to determine if there has been any change in eligibility. Updates to student records are made by the LEA staff upon receipt of the information, which is validated, from parents, students or school records. COEStar conducts data checks to ensure integrity of the data on the system. The system produces exception reports, which are subject to review by our Statewide Services office. The staff review may generate changes or updates to the information. The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by providing training to the Migrant Student Information Center personnel in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what data needs to be entered and when, along with technical assistance for them to enter into COEStar.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are shown as enrolled on a specific summer school line in COEStar with a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, they receive a

unique "I" code enrollment type which corresponds with Intersession.

---

### 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.

Since COEStar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEStar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source. The calculation of eligibility is relatively simple because the COEStar system contains a copy of the actual COE. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; and the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if the child can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEStar data searches and synchronization effectively eliminate this possibility). By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulation, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted. To maintain an audit track, COEs cannot be physically deleted after they are added to COEStar, but COEs determined to be ineligible may be disqualified. TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, Residency dates, Enrollment dates, Withdrawal dates, Departure dates, LEP, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate the child left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began. Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in category 2. Entry of this data means that the State served the child during the summer/intersession term. Additional services information can be added to indicate the nature of services but the summer/ intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service began. COEStar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state, region, county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level, eligible children are counted only once in each eligible category. Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in School wide and TA programs funded by MEP and in both regular and summer/intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

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.

Not applicable.

### 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.

Migrant Recruiters and Liaisons at the LEAs receive information directly from parents or guardians regarding eligibility for MEP services. Questionable data is reviewed and parents or guardians are asked to produce information to validate eligibility data. For example, the Liaison or Recruiter may ask for proof of qualifying employment, proof of a qualifying move and school records. Recruiters and Liaisons may query school records directly to verify information. Eligibility verification is done at the LEA level. Districts are required by the State to make annual contact with families and verify eligibility information. Residency is verified during these annual contact meetings. The State provides Identification and Recruitment trainings for both Migrant Recruiters and Migrant Clerks several times during the year. The State Recruitment Specialist does Migrant Program Orientation and Training for migrant staff as soon as a district hires their migrant personnel. Recruiter/Liaisons receive complete training on the rules, regulations, and guidelines for eligibility of Migrant students. Recruiters also receive basic training on COEStar and data entry requirements. Migrant clerks receive complete COEStar data input training and hands on training on the processing of Certificates of Eligibility. Migrant clerks also receive training on Migrant program regulations to ensure they are aware of the eligibility requirements of the program. This type of training ensures Migrant Recruiters/Liaisons and Clerks are cross trained so they are aware of the validity of the information they input and recruiters/liaisons are oriented in data input so they are able to enter COEStar to retrieve information on former and current Migrant students. All LEA MEP staff members are provided with the State of Arizona's Identification and Recruitment manual, copies of OME guidance, and copies of federal regulations. If an eligibility question does arise that a Migrant clerk is not able to resolve themselves, the State has procedures in place to resolve eligibility questions. First, LEA staff contact the State Identification and Recruitment specialist with questions regarding eligibility. If the question is not answered, the ID&R Specialist will contact the Migrant State Department of Education (ADE) Education Program Specialist for assistance. If the eligibility question is not resolved by the ADE Education Specialist, the Specialist will consult with the State Migrant Program Director for guidance. If the eligibility question is not resolved by the State Director, the State Director will contact the Office of Migrant Education (OME) in Washington, DC for assistance. COEStar mimics paper COE collection methods in that each COE can be marked as verified and locked. Invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes. Our Migrant Student Information Data Center staff will conduct Data Verification. The data centers produce and send a list of eligible students to each LEA on a monthly basis with a request to confirm the accuracy of the district counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff. In addition, Data Centers will conduct a yearly COE review. One year it will be on-site and the next year will be a paper review. Through this process they are also checking for eligibility, QAD, qualifying activity, dates and locations. Our data is also verified and validated at the State level. An ADE Education Specialist reviews all data from the Statewide Services office prior to submission into the CSPR. The Specialist reviews each individual student and checks against students with similar information to determine if there are duplicates that have not been identified in any of the other checks in place. Once this process has been completed, all possible duplicates are sent back to Statewide Services for staff to review. Any errors are corrected, the report is run again, and the process is repeated until the State and Statewide Services have agreed that all data is in fact unduplicated.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA conducted a prospective re-interview for the students included in 2011-2012 reporting period. In keeping with the MEP Federal Regulations 200.89 (b)(2)(ii), the ADE MEP used the recommended sample size of 50 families for the prospective re-interview process. TROMIK created the random list of students using a two-step process, which included the entire database of students who were eligible during the reporting period. TROMIK created a random ID by extracting four digits from their current SAIS/COEstar number. This new four number ID was then multiplied by 77 and then the students were reordered according to their new ID numbers. The second step used the RND() function in Access to assign a random decimal value and reordered. This step was completed twice to increase the random order of the students. The first 100 students on the list were sent to the SEA for use as the initial list. The SEA requested twice the recommended sample size to compensate for families who might not be located. The SEA selected SEA and LEA associates, not involved with determining original eligibility, to conduct the re-interviews. At the initial meeting of the associates, the names of the randomly selected students were placed in a container. The

associate's names were placed in a separate container and were drawn to determine the order in which the associates would draw the student's names. Each associate selected a name in rotation until each associate had pulled 10 names. The drawing process was completed three times to ensure each associate interviewed the required number of families. The associates were provided a re-interview document in English and Spanish to ensure continuity in the interview process. Only face-to-face interviews were conducted by the associates. After each interview was conducted, the associate was responsible for determining whether or not the initial eligibility determination was correct. The original eligibility determination for the 50 students re-interviewed was found to be without error. Therefore, the appeal process was not needed. The full SEA written procedures for this process are available upon request.

---

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.

COEStar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data. Since all COEStar data originates with the collection of the COE, COEStar is included in the overall Quality control process. Additional data, like enrollment and services data, is thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate. COEStar does not merge data. Staff at State Wide Services reviews COE data inputted at local terminals to ensure accuracy of the COE. Data verifications are done by sampling LEA COE's. The amount sampled correlated to the number of students in each program. This year, the Arizona Department of Education implemented a process for further testing and verification of the COEStar data. This process is designed to validate the information in COEStar by district, school, and student name to identify any errors that COEStar may not have picked up. Throughout the year, Statewide Services staff and staff from the Arizona Department of Education conduct staff development sessions where Recruiters, Liaisons and clerks are trained in the requirements of the Migrant Program including eligibility data input and validation. The Data Centers produce and send to each LEA a list of eligible students on a monthly basis with a request that the districts confirm the accuracy of their counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff. A similar process is also conducted by the ADE Education Specialists during the on-site monitoring of LEA MEPs. The Specialist reviews a random set of COEs and student files in the same process of Statewide Services.

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.

The State MEP Office requests student information from the Data Centers in the form of a table with information including student name, ID number, district, and school information. Identical matches and near matches are identified. Near matches are investigated by hand and a determination made as to whether they are the same child. Any near matches that are found to be duplicates are sent back to the data center for corrections to be made prior to the submission of the child count report. This process continues until all students have been individually looked at and no further changes are requested. When corrections have been made and a new count generated this information is then compared to previous year's numbers. Once all verification has been done, a final count is submitted to the Migrant Director for review. COEStar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and dependable. All numbers are double and triple checked against other sources to insure accuracy. In addition, reports are run throughout the year to monitor child counts as part of the quality control process.

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 will improve technical assistance and training to ID&R specialists and clerks to ensure familiarity with Title I Part C student eligibility laws, regulations, policies and procedures. The state will implement re-interview requirements as determined by federal law when new procedure requirements take effect. The State has also mandated that all ID&R Specialists and clerks attend training on the OME ID&R Curriculum. At onsite visits to the LEAs, SEA Migrant Staff will review a random sample of COEs to verify the eligibility determination and accurate documentation.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

The SEA is confident in the accuracy of the reported child counts and the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

---