

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**

CALIFORNIA



**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: California Department of Education		
Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Sonya Edwards		
Telephone: 916-327-2014		
Fax: 916-319-0971		
e-mail: sedwards@cde.ca.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Deb Sigman		
		Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 3:55:18 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 change	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2010-11	2010-11	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

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

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

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

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

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

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15

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

We will be moving to the SBAC assessments in 2014-15 for grades 3-8 and 11 in English-language Arts and Mathematics. We assume there will be new achievement standards adopted prior to the administration of the tests. We anticipate using new Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards in 2014-15 as well through the National Center and State Collaborative. The Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards will not be available after 2013-14. It is uncertain what will transpire with respect to the science standards, achievement standards and tests with the exception of the Alternate Assessment.

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	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.3 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)	20.00
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	80.00
Comments: 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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	3,252,506	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	21,435	97
Asian	S	373,189	>=99
Black or African American	S	213,430	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,698,634	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	18,421	98
White	S	848,459	98
Two or more races	S	78,938	93
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	348,257	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	685,025	99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	1,973,983	98
Migratory students	S	44,154	>=99
Male	S	1,664,228	98
Female	S	1,587,093	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Section 1.3.1 "All Students" does not count "Not participating" and "Medical exempt." All students counts include unidentified subgroups.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	176,372	50.64
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,844	5.70
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	118,513	34.03
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	33,528	9.63
Total	348,257	////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education established the eligibility criteria for the alternate assessment based on modified performance standards. IEP teams are required to use the criteria to establish those for whom the modified assessment is appropriate. California tests 4.7 million students per year in grades 2-11 for which approximately 700,000 are identified as SWD. California has not exceeded the flexibility (use of the modified assessment) of the 2% performing above proficient for AYP.

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	3,254,222	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	21,441	97
Asian	S	373,238	>=99
Black or African American	S	213,624	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,699,221	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	18,442	98
White	S	849,167	>=99
Two or more races	S	79,089	93
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	347,109	96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	685,096	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	1,975,045	98
Migratory students	S	44,156	>=99
Male	S	1,665,069	98
Female	S	1,587,935	>=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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	148,059	42.65
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,635	4.22
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	150,825	43.45
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	33,590	9.68
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	347,109	////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education established the eligibility criteria for the alternate assessment based on modified performance standards. IEP teams are required to use the criteria to establish those for whom the modified assessment is appropriate. California tests 4.7 million students per year in grades 2-11 for which approximately 700,000 are identified as SWD. California has not exceeded the flexibility (use of the modified assessment) of the 2% performing above proficient for AYP.

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	1,394,288	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	9,556	97
Asian	S	161,637	>=99
Black or African American	S	92,655	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	719,534	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	7,978	98
White	S	370,584	98
Two or more races	S	32,344	98
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	145,138	95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	239,973	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	825,522	98
Migratory students	S	18,168	98
Male	S	712,317	98
Female	S	681,504	98

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	60,341	41.57
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,201	5.65
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	62,858	43.31
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,738	9.47
Total	145,138	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education established the eligibility criteria for the alternate assessment based on modified performance standards. IEP teams are required to use the criteria to establish those for whom the modified assessment is appropriate. California tests 4.7 million students per year in grades 2-11 for which approximately 700,000 are identified as SWD. California has not exceeded the flexibility (use of the modified assessment) of the 2% performing above proficient for AYP.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	465,580	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,796	S	59
Asian	52,828	S	87
Black or African American	28,472	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	248,295	S	61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,493	S	67
White	117,600	S	79
Two or more races	13,096	S	74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,001	S	46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	148,595	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	291,157	S	60
Migratory students	6,709	S	53
Male	238,439	S	69
Female	226,787	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	465,512	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,797	S	39
Asian	52,819	S	69
Black or African American	28,478	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	248,257	S	35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,493	S	44
White	117,560	S	65
Two or more races	13,108	S	61
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	48,614	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	148,529	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	291,122	S	35
Migratory students	6,697	S	23
Male	238,277	S	45
Female	226,863	S	50
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Receive a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 3			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	459,859	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,917	S	57
Asian	51,771	S	88
Black or African American	29,413	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	244,828	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,584	S	68
White	116,431	S	78
Two or more races	11,915	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	51,010	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	130,678	S	53
Economically disadvantaged students	289,276	S	61
Migratory students	6,569	S	56
Male	235,148	S	68
Female	224,559	S	70

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	459,796	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,915	S	57
Asian	51,757	S	84
Black or African American	29,428	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	244,778	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,584	S	64
White	116,418	S	81
Two or more races	11,916	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	50,799	S	47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	130,585	S	39
Economically disadvantaged students	289,252	S	55
Migratory students	6,559	S	43
Male	235,039	S	62
Female	224,604	S	70

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Receive a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 4			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	462,851	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,914	S	51
Asian	52,458	S	85
Black or African American	30,406	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	245,122	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,548	S	63
White	117,801	S	74
Two or more races	11,602	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	53,232	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	108,757	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	289,936	S	56
Migratory students	6,783	S	51
Male	237,057	S	63
Female	225,662	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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	462,889	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,912	S	52
Asian	52,453	S	80
Black or African American	30,420	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	245,121	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,548	S	58
White	117,819	S	77
Two or more races	11,616	S	74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	53,059	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	108,692	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	289,948	S	49
Migratory students	6,775	S	36
Male	237,027	S	57
Female	225,729	S	64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	462,413	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,907	S	52
Asian	52,420	S	78
Black or African American	30,345	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	244,912	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,543	S	51
White	117,690	S	77
Two or more races	11,596	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	53,025	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	108,625	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	289,630	S	46
Migratory students	6,768	S	32
Male	236,778	S	60
Female	225,508	S	57

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	466,972	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,016	S	42
Asian	54,563	S	79
Black or African American	30,837	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	244,500	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,677	S	50
White	120,104	S	67
Two or more races	11,275	S	63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,227	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	88,785	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	288,321	S	43
Migratory students	6,557	S	36
Male	239,259	S	53
Female	227,557	S	54

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	467,255	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,021	S	51
Asian	54,577	S	78
Black or African American	30,896	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	244,571	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,680	S	54
White	120,218	S	75
Two or more races	11,292	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,185	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	88,761	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	288,486	S	46
Migratory students	6,558	S	34
Male	239,414	S	55
Female	227,681	S	62

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Receive a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 6			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	461,906	S	54
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,085	S	43
Asian	52,075	S	80
Black or African American	31,328	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	240,134	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,637	S	51
White	121,791	S	67
Two or more races	10,856	S	63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,696	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	75,157	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	280,844	S	43
Migratory students	6,085	S	39
Male	237,116	S	53
Female	224,654	S	54

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	462,041	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,086	S	54
Asian	52,062	S	81
Black or African American	31,356	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	240,151	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,643	S	55
White	121,881	S	77
Two or more races	10,862	S	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,615	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	75,119	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	280,918	S	48
Migratory students	6,084	S	36
Male	237,115	S	56
Female	224,788	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 3	# Students Who Receive a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in grade 7			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	461,229	S	46
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,198	S	35
Asian	52,405	S	74
Black or African American	31,438	S	29
Hispanic or Latino	238,180	S	35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,759	S	43
White	123,069	S	58
Two or more races	10,180	S	54
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	47,648	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	66,117	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	274,990	S	35
Migratory students	5,786	S	33
Male	235,808	S	44
Female	225,264	S	48

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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	464,351	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,237	S	50
Asian	52,524	S	79
Black or African American	31,844	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	239,769	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,780	S	55
White	123,925	S	74
Two or more races	10,272	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	48,734	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	66,743	S	16
Economically disadvantaged students	277,033	S	47
Migratory students	5,839	S	36
Male	237,718	S	54
Female	226,460	S	63

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	463,114	S	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,222	S	56
Asian	52,478	S	85
Black or African American	31,684	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	239,158	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,774	S	61
White	123,568	S	79
Two or more races	10,230	S	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	48,401	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	66,499	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	276,227	S	55
Migratory students	5,826	S	46
Male	236,992	S	66
Female	225,954	S	64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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	474,024	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,508	S	50
Asian	57,087	S	83
Black or African American	31,530	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	237,525	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,723	S	54
White	131,637	S	71
Two or more races	10,014	S	64
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	45,364	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	66,912	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	259,404	S	47
Migratory students	5,665	S	41
Male	241,349	S	58
Female	232,577	S	57

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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	472,378	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,473	S	51
Asian	57,046	S	75
Black or African American	31,202	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	236,574	S	44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,714	S	52
White	131,346	S	72
Two or more races	10,023	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	44,103	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	66,667	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	258,286	S	43
Migratory students	5,644	S	30
Male	240,479	S	51
Female	231,810	S	61

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	468,761	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,427	S	48
Asian	56,739	S	74
Black or African American	30,626	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	235,464	S	40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,661	S	45
White	129,326	S	69
Two or more races	10,518	S	62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	43,712	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	64,849	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	259,665	S	40
Migratory students	5,574	S	30
Male	238,547	S	54
Female	230,042	S	51

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of Male and Female excludes unknowns, the all Student subgroup does not exclude unknowns.

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	9,904	2,571	25.96
Districts	1,016	170	16.73

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	6,191	1,224	19.77
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4,955	830	16.75
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,236	394	31.88

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
949	164	17.28

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	261
Extension of the school year or school day	38
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	31
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	77
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	137
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	142
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	11
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	3
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	220
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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.

Beginning in 2003, the state Legislature appropriated a portion of the Title I, Part A set-aside for LEAs at-risk of improvement, in improvement, or in corrective action to use to improve student achievement. LEAs include districts and county offices of education. Due to the recession, only LEAs in corrective action are funded in 2011-2012. As documented in the California State Performance Report, LEAs must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in order to avoid improvement status. AYP is aggregated at the LEA level and disaggregated by numerically significant student groups. Predominately, California LEAs advance in improvement status based upon the performance of English learners and students with disabilities.

LEAs at risk of improvement: California Education Code (EC) Section 52055.57(a) requires the State Educational Agency (SEA) to identify and notice LEAs that are at risk of being identified for improvement within two years, providing them with research-based criteria to conduct a voluntary self-assessment. Available state assessment tools include: 1) the Academic Program Survey, (APS) which is designed to help a school analyze the extent to which it is providing a coherent instructional program to support improved student achievement; 2) the District Assistance Survey, which is designed to guide LEAs and their technical assistance providers in supporting school level improvement around the areas assessed in the APS; 3) the English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment, which serves as a district level tool for LEAs to analyze outcomes and program services for English learners (ELs); and 4) the Inventory of Services and Support for Students with Disabilities, which is designed to gain a deeper understanding of the learning needs of students with disabilities. These assessments are available at the California Department of Education State Program Assessment Tools Web page at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. LEAs are provided with technical assistance on the use of these tools through webinars and webcasts, and through the Regional System of District and School Support (RSDSS), which is one component of the Statewide System of School Support.

LEAs identified for improvement Years 1, 2, 3, or 3+ in 2011-12 must adhere to specific accountability requirements. These requirements are available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/leapiyrs.asp>. Additional information and resources are also available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/pilearesources.asp>.

LEAs in improvement Year 1: When an LEA is identified for improvement, it must notify parents; convene a district level team of teachers, parents, and school and district administrators to analyze achievement data for all students; conduct a comprehensive assessment of needs using the tools identified above; and write an Addendum to their LEA Plan identifying key action steps for improvement. LEAs are provided with technical assistance in the development and implementation of LEA Plans through CDE webinars and webcasts, ongoing telephone and e-mail support with CDE staff, and RSDSS support. Districts are directed to reserve no less than 10% of their Title I, Part A allocation for high quality professional development, which is an ongoing requirement in any year that the LEA remains in improvement. Additional information about Year 1 improvements requirements is available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/pirequirement.asp>.

LEAs in improvement Year 2: LEAs that failed to meet all AYP targets in 2011-12 advance to Year 2. LEAs must notify parents that the LEA remains in improvement, reserve at least ten percent of the LEA Title I allocation for professional development, and continue implementing their LEA Plan Addendum that was developed in Year 1. LEAs continue to receive technical assistance via the Statewide System of School Support.

LEAs in Year 3 corrective action: An LEA that advances to Year 3 corrective action is subject to additional Title I accountability requirements. In addition to parent notification and professional development set-asides, the LEA is subject to one or more sanctions as required by federal law. In addition, each LEA receives fiscal resources from the federal set-aside as specified in California EC Section 52055.57 (c). As of September, 2011, 282 LEAs have advanced to Year 3 corrective action. At present, all 282 LEAs in corrective action have been assigned Corrective Action 6 to "institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including participation in professional development for relevant staff, with special attention to the needs of high priority students." High priority students have been defined in California as ELs, students with disabilities, and students not meeting grade-level standards. Currently, 2 LEAs are assigned a trustee. Technical assistance for each LEA is differentiated based upon an index of the pervasiveness and severity of academic achievement problems. See California EC Section 52055.57(c). Selected LEAs with low index values are assigned to work with District Assistance and Intervention Teams (DAITs) or other technical assistance provider, whose responsibilities are to:

- Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment
- Make recommendations for improvement (based on the results of the needs assessment)
- Assist the LEA in revising its LEA Plan to document steps to implement the assigned corrective action

- Support the LEA in implementing the LEA Plan
- Monitor LEA implementation of the LEA Plan

LEAs must adopt the DAIT's recommendations unless exempted by the State Board of Education (SBE), and inform all parents of the assigned corrective action. State law provides that LEAs continue to implement their approved LEA Plan. The SEA may review the performance and progress of any LEA in corrective action at any time. In addition, California EC Code Section 52055.57(d)(5)(e) states any LEA that fails to exit improvement within three years shall appear before the SBE, who may, upon hearing testimony from the LEA, assign an alternative corrective action.

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	282
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	2
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)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	4	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	12/07/12
---	----------

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00%

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

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

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The California Department of Education (CDE) provided technical assistance to local educational agencies through Webinars, conference calls, and posting frequently asked questions and guidance to our CDE Web page. The CDE provides on-going technical assistance via e-mail and individual telephone calls. The CDE also conducted a statewide meeting providing information and guidance on School Improvement Grant strategies and requirements.

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.

Title I schools supported by State-funded programs are implementing the nine Essential Program Components endorsed by the State Board of Education (SBE):

- 1) Instructional Program: Standards-aligned English-language arts and mathematics textbooks and SBE adopted Pre-Algebra and Algebra I textbooks
- 2) Student access to high school standards-aligned core courses (master schedule and pacing schedule)
- 3) Principals' Instructional Leadership Training
- 4) Teachers' Professional Development Opportunities
- 5) Student Achievement Monitoring System
- 6) Ongoing instructional assistance and support
- 7) Teacher/Department and subject matter collaboration
- 8) Intervention programs for students performing below grade level standards
- 9) Fiscal support

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	2,091,675
Applied to transfer	30,184
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	12,697
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 38,895,129

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	433

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.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	1,666,325
Applied for supplemental educational services	265,208
Received supplemental educational services	154,405
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 186,341,963
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	744,424	668,732	89.83	10,089	1.36
All elementary classes	170,022	159,933	94.07	10,089	5.93
All secondary classes	574,402	508,799	88.58	65,603	11.42

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.

Yes, the state counts elementary classes so that a full day self-contained equals one class.
--

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	29.50
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	70.50
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	17.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	82.80
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	44,010	41,691	94.73
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	41,215	39,502	95.84
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	109,765	94,898	86.46
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	164,677	149,581	90.83

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	86.80	36.30
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Lunch Program	
Secondary schools	82.80	39.00
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Lunch Program	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Armenian, Cantonese, Chinese, French, German, Hmong, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Armenian, Cantonese, Chinese, French, German, Hmong, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Cantonese, Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Cantonese, Korean, Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Armenian, Filipino, French, Japanese, Khmer, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In California, dual language programs are also known as two-way immersion programs. We have entered the same information on both lines.

Other programs include English language mainstream (ELM), push-in ESL, after-school tutoring, English language development (ELD), Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD), Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), Rosetta Stone, Scholastic Read 180, Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI2), Foreign language programs, Spanish for Spanish Speakers, and Spanish Parent English Tutoring Program.

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	1,387,665
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The reported number does not include students who took the annual ELP assessment as a screener.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	1,318,345
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	1,173,839
Chinese	33,151
Vietnamese	33,065
Tagalog	20,203
Hmong	13,465

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	1,270,529
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	128,287
Total	1,398,816
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The count in CSPR section 1.6.3.1.1 includes those students who took the annual assessment and the initial assessment. The initial test is given continuously throughout the years and not all students who take the initial assessment are classified as LEP students. However, in section 1.6.2.1, we use the fall enrollment count, in the California Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), to report on the number of LEP students. These two sections do not match up because data for 1.6.3.1.1 is collected continuously throughout the year, while data in 1.6.2.1 is a point in time collection.</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	530,177
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	35.13
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.</p>	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,435,144
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	1,435,144
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. LEAs may discontinue services for some students based on local re-designation criteria after the CELDT results are received. As a result, there may be more students reported in this table than the number reflected in table 1.6.2.2. In California, all students who have a primary language that is not English are tested, therefore we believe all EL students in Title III LEAs were tested and the number not tested is zero. This table is sourced from EDEN file 138, which requires inclusion of first time test takers.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	231,460

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	738,885	61.39	674,063	56.00
Attained proficiency	474,530	33.06		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are two cohorts with two targets for the "Attained proficiency" category (AMAO 2):				
1) The total number of students for less than 5 years cohort is 912,782. The target is 20.1%.				
2) The total number of students for 5 years or more cohort is 522,362. The target is 45.1%.				

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California offers a Standard-bases test in Spanish (STS) in Reading-Language Arts in grades two through eleven. These assessments are not used in AYP determinations.</p>

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not offer a native language assessment in science.</p>

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
141,304	135,180	276,484

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
273,077	S	60	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
275,247	S	65	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
97,475	S	66	S
Comments: 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.)

Title III Results	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	706
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	97
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	583
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	416
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	157
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	84
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	61
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	127
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	330

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. The number of subgrantees that have not met Title III for four consecutive years includes newly identified subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years and subgrantees who have more than 4 consecutive years of not meeting Title III AMAOs.

The results for all consortium members and its lead are aggregated up to the consortium level and are used in calculating the consortium's LEA report. The consortium as a whole is required to meet the targets.

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>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

Comments: 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
176,994	5,862	177

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.	207,346
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	10,405

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	648	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	607	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	581	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	534	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	560	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	161	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	637	233,492
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	601	130,108
PD provided to principals	619	20,534
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	554	13,892
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	483	24,171
PD provided to community based organization personnel	196	9,850
Total	3,090	432,047

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development topics include vocabulary development; writing instruction; technology training; essential measurement standards; data analysis; data team collaboration; data-driven instruction; systematic ELD; advanced SDAIE; dual immersion principles; Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) training; Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD); Long Term English Learners (LTEL); Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI); differentiated instruction; Response to Intervention (RTI); Intensive Intervention Program for English learners; Gradual Release of Responsibility; Constructing Meaning; Common Core Standards; Rosetta Stone; Grammar Gallery; Spanish to English Biliteracy Transfer; Safety Net Programs; California English Language Development Test (CELDT) strategies; Scoring Trainer of Trainers (STOT) for administering and scoring the CELDT; Professional Learning Communities (PLC); English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and District-level English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) Leadership training; School Site Council (SSC) training; Parent engagement, including training parents to be trainers of other parents; Family Literacy Development; peer coaching; Thinking Maps; interpreter training; resource materials; articulation between school levels; anti-bullying, inclusion, empathy, and special needs; Culture of Poverty; Understanding by Design; supplemental reading intervention software for English learners; and federal program compliance monitoring.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/11	12/07/11	153
Comments: 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.

Distribution time has been significantly reduced as new online application and cash management systems are implemented and improved.
--

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: 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.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1,005	1,005
LEAs with subgrants	183	183
Total	1,188	1,188
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The EDFacts file C170 LEA Subgrant Status is only collected on the LEA level. Consequently, California is unable to submit data for direct funded charters on the LEA level. There is one direct funded charter school that received McKinney-Vento funds that cannot be included in C170 on the LEA level. Also, the row "LEAs without subgrants" does not include direct funded charters in the count.		

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)	337	841
K	11,188	12,545
1	10,571	13,195
2	9,422	12,142
3	8,963	11,608
4	8,380	11,474
5	8,064	11,020
6	7,591	10,962
7	6,953	10,985
8	6,440	10,437
9	6,128	11,343
10	5,962	11,003
11	5,512	10,393
12	5,170	10,101
Ungraded	22	152
Total	100,703	148,201

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	6,020	12,688
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	89,533	123,398
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	2,194	4,482
Hotels/Motels	2,956	7,633
Total	100,703	148,201

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	4,903
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10,949
K	27,412
1	28,542
2	27,080
3	25,832
4	24,895
5	23,775
6	24,091
7	22,937
8	22,405
9	22,430
10	21,581
11	19,959
12	19,329
Ungraded	4,125
Total	330,245
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	6,559
Migratory children/youth	4,967
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,396
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	72,545
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	18,669	5,827
4	18,079	9,170
5	17,509	7,850
6	17,052	7,228
7	16,278	7,098
8	15,216	6,195
High School	13,919	5,178

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	18,638	10,393
4	18,075	10,157
5	17,493	9,069
6	17,025	6,513
7	16,263	6,336
8	15,032	4,599
High School	13,976	5,650

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

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	17,460	7,477
6		
7		
8	15,119	7,424
High School	13,751	4,667

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)	14,678
K	9,157
1	7,574
2	9,152
3	8,452
4	8,103
5	8,006
6	7,840
7	7,837
8	7,016
9	7,214
10	7,103
11	6,877
12	9,339
Ungraded	637
Out-of-school	15,001
Total	133,986
Comments: 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.

There was a 13% decrease in the 12 months student Count of eligible migrant children and youth. Several factors contributed to the decrease in numbers of eligible migrant children and youth. They are as followed:

- 1) Migrant families not qualifying in the Migrant Education Program (MEP) because they're employed in non-qualifying work such as construction and restaurant related work;
- 2) Migrant workers seem to be in one location and are not moving;
- 3) Fewer jobs in temporary agriculture related jobs because of advancements in farm harvest mechanization;
- 4) MEP staff making better eligibility determinations.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8,150
K	4,151
1	4,694
2	5,005
3	4,811
4	4,557
5	4,489
6	4,487
7	4,091
8	3,564
9	3,539
10	3,639
11	3,381
12	1,631
Ungraded	96
Out-of-school	2,624
Total	62,909
Comments: 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.

There was a 18% decrease during the summer/intersession months student count of eligible migrant children and youth. Several factors contributed to the decrease in numbers of eligible migrant children and youth. They are as follows:

- 1) Migrant families not qualifying for the Migrant Education Program (MEP) because they're employed in non-qualifying work such as construction and restaurant related work;
- 2) Migrant workers seem to be in one location and are not moving;
- 3) Fewer jobs in temporary agriculture related jobs because of advancements in farm harvest mechanization;
- 4) MEP staff making better eligibility determinations.

The count for summer/intersession terms decreased due to the total decrease of our migrant student population count. Presently, school districts are offering summer programs that our migrant students are being encouraged to attend. We do not believe that there is less of an effort to provide summer/intersession services. In fact, our present District Service Agreement and Regional Application requests that regions offer services to a greater number of students and offer meaningful instruction in a set time and days by a highly qualified teacher using scientifically researched based curriculum based on grade level as called for by state statute. It is a bigger challenge to encourage migrant children to attend migrant education programs due to other options students have.

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.

Migrant Education Regional Offices entered Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data via COEStar (software program) by TROMIK. The Migrant Education Regions then used COEStar to transmit records electronically to the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) server at WestEd. The same systems were used to generate the Category 1 and 2 child counts for the last reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1

How data was collected and what data were collected:

The CA MEP uses a COE that was approved by the OME Program Officer. The OME Program Officer confirmed that the COE was in compliance with the following national COE standards:

- Required data elements which the State organized according to State preference
- Required data sections were maintained whole and unaltered
- State required information is collected in the available space

All of the COE elements on that COE are entered into COEstar. The COEstar user interface presents a facsimile of the paper COE so no fields are missing.

Activities Conducted to Collect the Data: The data collection begins at the Regional level or in the case of directly funded districts at the school district level. Recruiters assigned to the Migrant Regional Offices are community based. District recruiters can be school based or they can perform community based identification and recruitment. All recruiters were trained to conduct interviews applying the revised eligibility criteria as described in the 34 CFR 200 that went into effect August 28, 2008. A state-developed and OME approved COE is used to record the migrant family's eligibility for the MEP. Community based recruiters search out eligible migrant families through a variety of means.

A recruiter may choose to use the telephone to make appointments for an interview, pre-screen, or to make general notes, but the eligibility interview itself may not be conducted over the telephone. It must be conducted face-to-face. Once an interview has been conducted, it is permissible to telephone the family for additional information or for clarification of facts.

A school based recruiter might be assigned by the region to work in a single school, several schools or several school districts, depending on the region's organizational structure. The school based recruiter works closely with school administrations to participate in any preregistration activities before the start of a school term. The recruiter establishes a working relationship with principals, counselors, school secretaries, school nurses, ESL teachers, bus drivers and teaching assistants to promote the migrant program and seek assistance in identifying potentially eligible families.

A community based recruiter search for migrant families where the families live, work, shop, worship and at community-based organizations or service agencies where they might seek services or assistance. These recruiters also distribute MEP informational flyers and brochures in key locations.

School based recruiters that are assigned to cover more than one school site use tablet PCs as their primary tool, with paper COEs as a backup. Recruiters assigned to a single site use PC workstations since they do not need the portability of a Tablet PC.

Recruiters use a paper COE or an electronic version using the Tablet PC. All COE data including signatures are captured on the electronic form just as they are on the paper form. In the conventional method using the paper COE, when the form has been completed by the recruiter, the reviewer assess the form for accuracy and completeness and signs the COE. The COE is submitted to the data entry section for input into the local database (COEstar). Before the COE information is permanently applied to the local database a final quality review is conducted.

Category 2

Data Collection Process:

The summer/intersession enrollment information is collected at the end of each project. The project administrator at the school district or region submits the list of participants or project roster to the designated person at the region (this can be a program coordinator, supervisor or data entry person, depending on the size and organizational structure of the region). This person reviews the information to ensure that it contains the needed information; student name, student id, project name, project code, project start and end dates, and whether it is a summer or an intersession service.

After the roster is reviewed and approved, it is given to the data entry operator for entry into COEstar. The region generates pre-formatted project enrollment forms that contain all the required fields for each district and the region and distributes them at the start of the summer or intersession period. The projects can use their own forms, provided they contain the

required information.

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.

How data for Category 1 are inputted into the state system for Childcount purposes

Recruiters use a paper COE or an electronic version using the Tablet PC. All COE data including signatures are captured on the electronic form just as they are on the paper form. In the conventional method using the paper COE, when the form has been completed by the recruiter, the reviewer assess the form for accuracy and completeness and signs the COE. The COE is submitted to the data entry section for input into the local database (COEstar). Before the COE information is permanently applied to the local database a final quality review is conducted.

COEstar is a star based system with multiple tablets reporting to a "host system" that serves to consolidate the data at the region level. Data is transferred from the tablet to the host and master copies of identifying data are sent back to tablets. Since the tablet contains a copy of the region's identifying data, the recruiter can perform the search locally (in the field).

In a similar pattern, the regional "host systems" send data to MSIN for statewide consolidation. All records at the MSIN are once again tested (by means of a matching algorithm) for duplicates by comparing names, birth dates, sex and parents' names. If the automated matching process cannot determine an exact match, human intervention is required to resolve the potential inter-region and intra-region duplicates. This task is performed by regionally designated data stewards using the "Resolve Duplicates" online system. All potential duplicates must be resolved before the CSPR is produced. The process is similar to the MSIX Near Match Work List Items, and it is very accurate.

How data for Category 1 are updated in the state system for Childcount purposes

To verify residence in years two and three of eligibility, California requires that regions make contact with all families and youth in their areas at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date) to learn if they family is still in the area, has made another qualifying move, or is in need of program services. The regions must document:

- The nature of the contact (was it by phone or a face-to-face visit)
- Verify that the children listed on the COE are still at the residence (have any children moved or become deceased)
- Any children (between the ages of birth up to age 22) have joined the household since the last move
- If a worker has moved to seek or obtain employment, and a child has also moved since the last qualifying arrival date.

If it is determined that a new qualifying move has been made, the recruiter must make a personal visit to complete a new COE.

Children are not counted unless there is an indication of residency during the reporting period. That means they have to have one or more of the following: qualifying move date, a new residency date, an enrollment date (either residency enrollment for non-attendees or a school enrollment date for attendees) during the period.

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.

Since the count of students that are served during summer and inter-sessions are a subset of the 12 month count of students, all data are based on the state's OME approved, national COE.

As mentioned previously, hard copies of the summer/intersession records are input into a local (LEA or Regional) database by data entry personnel.

The data entry personnel work from lists that are generated by the Regional office through COEstar. The lists are distributed to each district to record the student that received the service, the student ID, grade, type of service, as well as the start and end dates of the service. LEAs and Regions are instructed to submit the service updates as soon as possible at the end of the summer/intersession project.

The updated record data is transferred electronically to the MSIN (statewide database). Updates are applied to the statewide database within 24 hours of receipt. There are several monitoring reports posted on the MSIN to assist the LEAs and Regions in checking the accuracy of their submissions and make any needed corrections.

The Summer & Intersession Enrollment/Services List is a customizable report option in COEstar. The list can be produced for Regional, district and school level use. For Summer program/project enrollments, the list can contain a list of all the

students that were enrolled during the regular term, and that are eligible to receive summer services. In the case of intersession programs/projects, the list can be produced to display students enrolled by track. Each student line contains the student name, Student ID, DOB, QAD and Grade. The Regional, district or school program/project coordinator enters the enrollment and withdrawal dates in the fields provided on the list for each child and marks the program/project code in which the student participated. The list can be produced to collect data on a single program/project or multiple projects provided at the site. At the end of the project, the program/project coordinator signs and dates the completed list and submits the form for entry into the regional COEstar database.

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.

To avoid reporting duplicate students, the MSIN performs a duplicated student test. The duplicate students test is an automated process that examines names, birth dates, sex and parents names for possible duplicate records between or within regions. The results are compiled into lists that are presented to the regions' data stewards on a management web site for resolution. The data stewards compare the records and make a determination if the students listed are the same or different and mark them appropriately. Once all involved stewards have made a final determination, the records are either kept separately or merged together depending on the outcome of the determination.

The potential duplicates that are presented to the data stewards for resolution are monitored by CDE on the MSIN web site. The CDE consultants can view:

- The current statewide status by region
- The number of unresolved potential duplicates
- The number of pairs resolved today
- Conflicts in duplicate determinations with other regions
- Date last resolved

Children who were between 3 and 21

An automated procedure in the Performance Reporter produces a table that contains a list of all students who might be eligible to be counted or served by the program. One of the conditions that the algorithm looks for is if the child turned 3 years of age during the reporting period or had not turned 22 years of age before the start of the reporting period. Any student record not included in this table cannot be considered for eligibility.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)

To verify residence in years two and three of eligibility, California requires that regions make contact with all families and youth in their areas at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date) to learn if the family is still in the area, has made another qualifying move, or is in need of program services. The regions must document:

- The nature of the contact (was it by phone or a face-to-face visit)
- Verify that the children listed on the COE are still at the residence (have any children moved or become deceased)
- Any children (between the ages of birth up to age 22) have joined the household since the last move
- If a worker has moved to seek or obtain employment, and a child has also moved since the last qualifying arrival date.

If it is determined that a new qualifying move has been made, the recruiter must make a personal visit to complete a new COE.

Children are not counted unless there is an indication of residency during the reporting period. That means they have to have one or more of the following: qualifying move date, a new residency date, an enrollment date (either residency enrollment for non-attendees or a school enrollment date for attendees) during the period.

Children who were resident in your state for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)

Some documented encounter event must occur during the reporting year in order for the child to be counted. Those events are a qualifying move, a documented residency move or an enrollment (either non attendee or school enrollment).

School records for all 12th grade students who are eligible for the MEP at the beginning of the school year, or who arrive during the school year, are checked at the end of the school year to determine if they received a high school diploma. If they have, their migrant student records are flagged with a Termination Flag code of "G" to indicate the student Graduated and

the date of graduation. The algorithm checks for this flag and excludes the child from the child count in subsequent years.

Out of School Youth (OSY) advocates/coordinators track OSY participating in GED programs. When OSYs completed the requirements for the GED, their migrant student records are flagged with a Termination Flag code of "E" to indicate the student has received the GED and the date of completion. The algorithm checks for this flag and excludes the child from the child count in subsequent years.

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.

Children who in the case of Category 2 - received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term

The Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment and services in a summer or intersession term in order to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. A description indicating the nature of service is also required. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when the service began.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

Each student has a unique identification number. That number is used to determine the unique set of students for the state. Each child's school record history during the year is examined to determine the highest grade attained during the year, during the regular term and the summer term at the state level and at each LEA the child attended. For Part I reports, each unique child is reported by the maximum grade attained in the state.

The algorithm that produces the Category 2 child counts checks for Termination Flags "G", Graduation, "E", Completed GED or "D" Deceased. Any service with a start date after the Termination Flag Date is excluded from the Category 2 student counts. A report is generated to notify that Region that an invalid enrollment was entered after the Termination date and that the entry needs to be removed.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The CA MEP has developed a web based Identification and Review (I&R) Issues Clarification Center managed by West Ed to assure consistency in the interpretation of eligibility guidance and uniform application of eligibility criteria statewide. The purpose of this center is to provide policy and procedure information for I&R topics which are unclear or not specifically addressed in the I&R Manual. Regional staff first address their questions to their I&R Supervisor/Advisory Committee member. Committee members are encouraged to post questions directly into this site. Questioners who prefer anonymity can send questions to CDE by email and their questions appear anonymously. The State I&R Support Team after deliberation and consultation post a discussion and answer to each question. Every effort is made to respond in a timely manner. All Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) members (there are currently over 1,300 active account members representing State, Regional and District level staffs) can view all the postings. Once the answer has received final approval by the CDE Migrant Office it is effective immediately. Issues that generate an update to the I&R Manual will be addressed in periodic "Updates to the I&R Manual" posted in the MSIN Intranet Documents section.

The California Department of Education (CDE) has instructed the regions to perform "Quality Control" checks on all COEs using the quality control checks on all COEs described in the designated SEA Reviewer process described in Section 1.10.3.2. CDE has developed the following quality control documents to guide the regions in establishing effective and efficient procedures and staff training:

- I&R Manual (includes COE Instructions)
- Guidance related to new Regulations Governing Title I, Part C - Migrant Education Program 34 CFR 200

In addition, the CDE I&R manual contains a Certificate of Eligibility Monitoring Checklist and instructions on how to use this checklist. CDE consultants are assigned regions to monitor on an ongoing basis. The process includes the I&R component.

Migrant Education staffs responsible for interviewing migrant families and completing COEs receive ongoing training at the regional level. At the regional level it is common practice for staff to meet once a month for training. CDE also provides statewide training. Statewide training has traditionally been provided annually at the Migrant Student Identification and Recruitment and Data Training and will be conducted regionally this year to reach all recruiters across the state.

At the collection/electronic-input stage COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Each COE can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes. COEstar presents an electronic facsimile of the actual paper COE developed by California and approved by the OME. COEstar prohibits deleting COEs but if a family is later determined to be ineligible, the COE can be marked as ineligible and will not be considered in CSPR reports. Once a COE is confirmed to be accurate by the assigned reviewer, it is locked to prevent any subsequent changes and only an administrator can unlock the COE.

The final quality check before the data is permanently applied to the local database is performed by the data entry operator. Before the COE is entered, the data entry operator does a search of the local database to see if there is an existing record for the family. If this is a new family, the COE is entered. If a record of previous eligibility exists, the new COE is compared with the existing records for possible discrepancies, such as conflicts in eligibility, residence, enrollment and birth dates. COEs with questionable information will be returned to the recruiter's supervisor. Resolving eligibility questions at the Local Level - When a recruiter encounters a situation where the eligibility status of a family is not clear, the recruiter will consult the State I&R Manual. If the answer to the recruiter's eligibility question is not conclusively answered in the Manual, the recruiter will search the Issues Clarification Center in the MSIN Intranet. If this initial research does not provide the answer, the recruiter will present the question to the I&R Supervisor/Coordinator. If the Supervisor/Coordinator can resolve the issue, the recruiter will be instructed on how to proceed with the eligibility determination. The case will be documented and added as a topic for discussion at the monthly I&R Meeting.

Resolving eligibility questions at the State Level - If the question cannot be resolved at the regional level after review by Regional staff, the I&R Supervisor/Coordinator will submit the question to the State Issues Clarification Center (SICC). The Regional Director and the I&R Supervisor/Coordinator are the only regional staff authorized to submit eligibility questions to the SICC. When preparing to submit the question to the SICC, the Regional staff must determine if the scenario is one that would arise infrequently or if it is a situation that is broader in scope (a statutory or regulatory requirement issue that may affect the eligibility of many children). In either case, the Region will provide the SICC with all relevant facts that would affect the eligibility determination, and the number of children whose eligibility would potentially be affected. The SICC staff receiving the question from the Region evaluates the question using eligibility criteria and in consultation with CDE staff before responding with an official determination.

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 Migrant Education Program (MEP) is responsible for ensuring that it recruits, counts, and serves only those children and youth who meet program eligibility requirements. To comply with federal regulations, California's MEP contracted an independent contractor, Johnson, Bassin, and Shaw (JBS) International to carry out prospective re-interviews for a random sample of children identified as eligible during the 2011-12 program year. The contract was designed to specifically conduct a re-eligibility survey of California K-12 Migrant Education participants that provides California Department of Education (CDE) with a reliable statewide discrepancy rate, as well as discrepancy rates for key regions. Additionally, the data gathered would assist the regions and the State in targeting specific issues for additional review and training in identification and recruitment (ID&R) of migrant students. The ultimate goal of the prospective re-interviews is to provide findings and recommendations that will support continuous improvement and reduce erroneous eligibility determinations.

Independent contractor JBS International completed 863 re-interviews in California covering eligibility determinations from 2011-12 school year. JBS used a standard re-interview format implemented by trained, experienced re-interviewers who were English and Spanish fluent. For the re-interviewing samples were drawn by JBS staff from a list provided by WestEd from the statewide database covering COEs signed between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012. WestEd verified that all students with eligibility determinations submitted during this time period were available in the database at the time the samples were drawn and were included in the sampling frame. The sample was stratified and includes subsamples for Region 2,3,5,6,8 and 16 which were identified for special attention based on their contribution to the prior year's discrepancy rate. All other regions were grouped together.

The re-interviewers were given a list of 1,441 sampled children which contained the address, phone number, COE signing date and name or relationship of the individual originally interviewed. They were also provided with sealed copies of the COEs. Interviews were scheduled by phone (when possible) and conducted in person (in every case). Contact attempts were made for every sampled child, with a minimum of three attempts and at least one "drop-in" contact attempt for those who were not contactable by phone. Interviews were conducted with person who was recorded on the COE as having provided the original eligibility interview. Interviews were conducted in the language spoken by interviewee. In most cases this was Spanish, although some parents preferred English. Translators were used for languages other than English or Spanish.

The re-interviewers conducted the first part of the interview (addressing their most recent move before the COE signing date) and once information on the respondent's most recent move prior to the COE signing date was collected, the seal COE copy was opened. If the dates for the move matched, then the re-interviewer would (immediately) cross check the move, crop, task and other information provided by the parent during the re-interview with the COE information. If the dates did not match, the re-interviewer would ask parent for the next prior (or subsequent) move. Once the re-interviewer determined that they had the information for the correct move, they would cross check the details for that move and record discrepancies between the COE and the re-interview information. Where discrepancies were identified the interviewer would ask the parent for additional information to determine the reason for the discrepancies or clarify the information provided. The completed re-interview forms were returned to JBS for eligibility determination.

Every re-interview was reviewed at least two times by separate JBS staff members working independently. Complicated re-interviews which were potentially ineligible received a minimum of three independent reviews. As a cross check, a random sample of completed re-interview determinations was completely re-interviewed independently, and all determinations matched. Each re-interview was reviewed to ensure that all eligibility criteria were met. Reasons for both minor discrepancies and discrepancies leading to ineligibility were documented in a data set and then categorized by the reason. All cases which JBS staff identified as ineligible were returned to their respective region for appeal. One re-interview eligibility determination was overturned on appeal. At this time, 11 re-interviews are being reviewed as JBS flagged these students as likely to be qualified even though the COE was in error. These students either had additional moves or an additional parent worker on the re-interview form that appeared qualified.

Statewide Re-interviews Results:

In the statewide sample 58 students out of the 863 interviews were identified as ineligible for the overall (raw) discrepancy rate of 6.7 percent or a weighted discrepancy rate of 8.7 percent for California with a 95 percent confidence interval less than plus or minus 5 percentage points. The most common errors were that the child did not move (13 students), the family did not move (14 students) or no qualifying work was sought or found (15 students). An additional six errors resulted from date errors - the child being older than 21 or the qualifying arrival date being beyond three years in the past. However 11 of the 58 students may be eligible if a new COE is completed documenting other pre-COE moves or another worker's experience.

California could potentially reduce its discrepancy rate by addressing two items in its upcoming recruiter training. First, in several cases, COEs were in error because the recruiter wrote up the most recent move when it was not eligible and there was a less recent but still qualifying move. Second, some recruiters wrote on the COE that the qualifying worker had obtained employment when they actually sought, and not found, work in other crops - a qualifying activity.

The state could also reduce its discrepancy rate by using machine edits on newly completed COEs submitted to the state database. These could easily flag COEs for review if the QAD is more than three years before the COE sign date or the student is over age 21 on the COE sign date.

According to the Re-Interview Report for the California Department of Education Migrant Education Program, the response rate for California was 60% (page 8). " The reasons for non-response can be attributed to the delay in conducting the re-interviews , the interval between the original recruitment and the re-interview was greater than a year. In some cases non-response issues generally occurred when re-interviewers were not able to contact the sample members who had moved out of the area. A secondary reason for no-response was due to invalid addresses or contact numbers. In addition, non-response rates included families that refused to participate in the study, as it was not mandatory".

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The vendors, WestEd and TROMIK Technology, provide reports to CDE and the Regional offices on an ongoing basis. The reports include student information with respect to eligibility, enrollment and services. WestEd is contracted by CDE to manage and maintain the Migrant (MSIN), the statewide migrant student database and student locator. TROMIK Technology's COEstar software is licensed by CDE to collect the eligibility, enrollment and service information at the region and district level.

WestEd provides continuous feedback to the regions and CDE regarding eligibility enrollment, services and mobility throughout the year, via online reports, and the duplicates resolution page.

The entry of data into COEstar (TROMIK Technology) is managed by the implementation of field level data validation checks that are based on the State I&R Manual (2011), Guidance and OME policy and regulations requirements. This first level of verification insures that the elements entered agree with a consistent logic and COE elements requiring comments have those elements populated. The data is further examined by reports available on the MSIN Locator (WestEd) looking for logical inconsistencies, duplication of families and students, areas of concern where comment verbiage is not aligned with the COE section, where a student is eligible but not enrolled in a program center or is enrolled in services. Likewise COEstar has similar local reports.

This level of verification is for all program elements: COE data, services and enrollment data, etc.

If there are questions regarding how to enter data, or the appropriateness of data WestEd maintains a toll free help line and email address (staffed Monday through Friday, 8 AM to 5 PM) for data, I&R questions and also an issue forum (Issues Clarification Center). There are subject experts available to work with any request that comes in.

-What processes do they follow? What "current information on their current recruitment efforts" do the vendors provide?

The current information on recruitment efforts are based on summary and detail reports, both in COEstar and MSIN Locator and include counts, data issues identified, COEs in process, COEs completed (signed by SEA Reviewers), services, etc. There are instant counts available for Category 1 and Category 2, along with monthly unduplicated counts. These reports are continuously available and are added to throughout the year.

-Does CDE or its vendors provide subgrantees with student lists to check for accuracy? Do they audit COEs or other child count records?

There are several reports available from the MSIN Locator website where subgrantees create verification and validation lists, check statuses of enrollments by program center and student status (end of eligibility dates, services, graduation or completion).

As California is a majority electronic COE (eCOE) state. Migrant recruiters use tablet PCs with a migrant student information system installed to complete the forms and transmit them to Regional offices of review before completion and submission. Where paper COEs are created Regional data clerks enter the data into the migrant student information system, COEstar. The Regional COEstar databases are the source information for the statewide consolidated database (MSIN).

The process to verify that the COE and additional migrant student information in statewide consolidated database (MSIN) matches the Regional data (in COEstar) is:

Each quarter 6 Regions will be selected at random (5 in the fourth quarter for a total of 23 Regions) for audit. 25 randomly selected COEs created in the current academic year for each Region will be printed from the MSIN database. These COEs will then be compared against the Regional COEstar COE and any discrepancies noted and investigated. If the Region has a paper original, that document will be compared against the Regional COEstar COE and the MSIN COE. CDE will maintain the records of COEs compared and the findings by Region.

Regions will not repeat in an academic year and the selection begins new each year.

Together, they provide regional directors current information on their current recruitment efforts. If the child counts in a region(s) are much lower or higher than the year before, vendors and CDE consultants work with the regions to insure that the data is correct. Data are checked for completeness throughout the year.

In addition 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. All data kept by COEstar databases is relational based on internal keys and all information for a child is related. The system supports data synchronization between multiple stand-alone systems using very accurate and proprietary technology developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation. This method relies on record stamping using keys and data signatures to determine how data is exchanged and consolidated. The process is similar to other database synchronization methods but is much more refined and precise.

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 CSPR Part I counts are calculated using two different programs and algorithms, independently developed. One resides on MSIN and produces the monthly CSPR counts and the final annual count. The other is a stand-alone program called the Performance Reporter which produces the report to be submitted and all subsequent EDEN files. On a specific cutoff date established by the state, the database is locked and an archive copy is made to be kept for future audit purposes. Both programs are then run against the final data and the results are compared on a student by student basis to confirm the accuracy of the final CSPR counts. Any discrepancies are examined and compared to the business rules. Any discrepancies from the business rules are repaired in the program or programs causing the discrepancy and the results are again compared. For 2011, there were no discrepancies between the two programs.

The business rules for the CSPR are the CSPR instructions, OME rules and current regulations established by OME.

The State Director reviews the CSPR counts monthly and reviews the State Summary file produced by the Performance Reporter showing the state level, region level and LEA level count breakouts. Any concerns are addressed before the final report is submitted. The first State Summary files are available for inspection in August.

In addition to the steps described above, prior to certifying data on the CSPR, the program office must deliver a copy of the supporting data (e.g., Eden data file, etc.) and business rules on a CD or DVD to the department's CSPR Coordinator.

Criteria for Supporting Documentation:

- Should support numerical data (not narrative) responses to the CSPR.
- Should provide sufficient detail to reproduce the CSPR data entries if needed in any future audits or evaluations.
- Should be in a format that an auditor can read and understand (e.g., Excel or MS-Word). If the nature of the data requires providing it in another format (e.g., SAS) the office should contact the CSPR Coordinator and provide an explanation of how the auditor can view the supporting documentation.
- The data must be of sufficient detail to allow an auditor to see underlying detail that supports totals. For example, if the CSPR data is a count of districts with a specific status, the supporting document should list the data at the district level. If the CSPR is a count of schools with a status, the supporting document should list the data for each school. The document should also reflect the sum of the detail.
- Each supporting document on the CD should be named to reflect the corresponding CSPR section number (e.g., CSPR 1.6.1).
- The CD and CD case must have a label that clearly reflects the following:
 - 1) The year and part(s) of the CSPR.
 - 2) For each section of the CSPR, the full name and phone number of the person that is responsible for answering any questions related to the supporting documentation.

- Totals in supporting documentation must match, exactly, the totals reported in the CSPR.

The CA CSPR child counts are the products of the data collected by the regions through COEstar and transferred to the MSIN statewide database. To verify the accuracy of the child counts, CDE, instructed TROMIK and WestEd to develop child count queries, based on the exact business rules (eligibility rules), independent from one another. Every year, after all the data from regions has been uploaded to the MSIN and the database is locked (no additional updates are accepted); the MSIN child count query is run. The TROMIK Performance Reporter is run against the same data set on MSIN. Each system produces a list of eligible student records indicating whether they are eligible for Category 1 only or eligible for both Category 1 and 2. The outcomes from both systems are compared. Occasionally there are differences of as little as one or two records. This is rare, but when these differences do arise, the CDE Consultant will make the final determination. The eligibility status code will be updated in the database according to the CDE determination.

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.

CDE will implement the following corrective actions to improve the accuracy of the Migrant Education Program (MEP) eligibility determinations:

- 1) CDE has redesigned the format for the annual identification and recruitment trainings. The statewide I&R training 2013 will be mandatory training for all MEP staff who sign COEs such as recruiters and state designated reviewers. Instead of having a centralized two day training in Sacramento, the migrant education office will be providing training at various sites throughout California (Sacramento-Feb.5, 2013, Monterey-Feb.7, 2013, San Diego-Feb.21, 2013, Fresno-Feb 21, 2013, Bakersfield-Feb.26, 2013). The focus of the training will be to provide recruiters with a standardized Identification and Recruitment (I&R) Training aimed at reducing the statewide error rate related to the mobility factor. The objectives of the statewide training are:
 - a) Recruiters will receive training on the basic eligibility factors;
 - b) Recruiters will be schooled on general interviewing skills and good practices;
 - c) Recruiters will review sections of the COE 2010 that are directly related to mobility;
 - d) Recruiters will cover curriculum on personal accountability and ethics;
 - e) Recruiters will develop a first draft of a personal action plan to aid the statewide efforts to reduce mobility-related errors.
- 2) Require documentation from all regional offices that the annual verification of migrant families is completed on an annual basis.
- 3) Continue use of CDE's 2010 COE to assist recruiters in determining the difference between vacation moves and changes of residence due to economic necessity.
- 4) Ensure that there is documentation for moves to and from Mexico occurring during school breaks.
- 5) Provide training to recruiters on interviewing techniques so recruiters are documenting the correct qualifying move of the family on the COE.
- 6) Continue the use of monitoring reports to promote accurate and complete information on the COE. CDE will use automated procedures in the MSIN database to double check on the COE review process by querying every COE that is submitted to the Statewide database for:
 - a) Missing information;
 - b) Date conflicts;
 - c) Ambiguous move information;
 - d) Correct bases for determining temporary work;
 - e) Missing documentation or comments for special conditions;
 - f) Missing prior history or credible evidence when work is sought but not obtained.
- 7) CDE will continue to conduct an independent re-interview process for 2012-13. The re-interviews will be conducted by an independent contractor.

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.

To address this concern, the Identification and Recruitment (I&R) Manual was updated in 2011. It is our goal that only children who are eligible for the Migrant Education Program (MEP) are recruited, counted, and enrolled.

It is the responsibility of each staff person, from recruiter to the administrator who works in the I&R of migrant children, to know the child eligibility requirements and to ensure quality control. In addition, the MEP requires that the regional staff make contact with all families and youth in their area at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date) to learn if the family is still in the area, has made another qualifying move, or is in need of program services.

The Migrant Education Office (MEO) has begun to initiate efforts to improve areas of quality control over the past year by establishing the following procedures and policies. First, MEO has designated State Education Agency (SEA) reviewers in all of the regions who are the "gatekeepers" of the system. The SEA reviewers are responsible for certifying all Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) to ensure eligibility. They sign as the "Designated SEA Reviewer" in Section XI of the COE and record the date of the review. All designated SEA reviewers are responsible for attending and participating in all state and regional I&R conferences, trainings, workshops, webinars, videos conferences, meetings, and other venues for obtaining the most accurate and current information on MEP eligibility. Designated SEA reviewers have the personal responsibility for remaining current on all policy issues related to eligibility, including state issued postings to the Issues Clarification Center, updates to the California I&R Manual, emails, training material, and other forms of communication related to the I&R of migrant children and youth. These steps are currently being implemented and monitored. This year we will review effectiveness of these processes to determine other steps that may need to be taken or revised.

As part of California's quality control policy it has removed from the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) all migrant children who were found to be ineligible as a result of the 2010-11 re-interview process. This procedure will continue with any migrant children found to be ineligible in the 2011-12 re-interview process. For documentation purposes, the MEO has provided copies of COE's of migrant students that were removed from the MSIN and letters sent from regional offices to migrant parents informing them of their ineligibility. This process is beginning to inform our quality control at the SEA level.

In addition, CDE has contracted with Johnson, Bassin, and Shaw to conduct an independent statewide prospective re-interview plan for Fiscal Year 2012-13. These re-interviews will provide CDE with reliable statewide discrepancy rate, as well as reliable discrepancy rates for key regions and will assist the regions and the state in targeting specific issues for additional review and training in identification and recruitment of migrant students. The ultimate goal of this re-interviewing is to provide findings and recommendations that will support continuous improvement and reduce erroneous eligibility determinations. This research is critical to our ongoing efforts to improve this most essential activity. To ensure a continuation of review the MEO is developing a call for proposals to ensure continued re-interviewing for at least 3 more years. In addition, MEO will hire this year a consultant whose sole responsibility will be the oversight of this contract along with all state-wide I&R activities. These efforts will both guide and assist California in improving both the child counts and the internal mechanisms and processes for I&R activities, including training, monitoring and development.

CDE has removed the COEs from MSIN of the ineligible children identified in the Re-Interview Report. However, we have not adjusted our category 1 and 2 child counts of children found ineligible in our 2011-12 prospective re-interviews. At this time, we are beginning the process to remove all children found ineligible from the category 1 and 2 child count.