

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

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

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



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

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2011-12 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Georgia Department of Education	
Address: 205 Jesse Hill Jr. Dr. SE Atlanta, Georgia 30334	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Levette Williams	
Telephone: 404-463-6504	
Fax: 404-656-0978	
e-mail: lewillia@doe.k12.ga.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. John D. Barge	
_____	Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 8:52:02 AM
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	2012-2013	2012-2013	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

Georgia is implementing the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards in Language Arts and Mathematics during the 2012-2013 school year.
--

**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>No Revisions or changes</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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	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

**1.1.2 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.

No Revisions or changes	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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.

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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	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

**1.1.3 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)	50.00
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	50.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<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 type="checkbox"/> No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<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 type="checkbox"/> No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	883,066	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,817	98
Asian	S	31,546	>=99
Black or African American	S	327,888	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	106,339	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	389,117	>=99
Two or more races	S	26,359	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	103,223	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	51,255	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	526,528	98
Migratory students	S	1,965	>=99
Male	S	450,577	98
Female	S	432,489	>=99

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Georgia, the state standardized assessment for high school students changed from the Georgia High School Graduation Test, to the End-Of-Course test. For students to be counted as participating, the student must have been enrolled in the course and received a final grade in the course. For students to be counted as having received a valid proficiency score, the student must have been FAY (enrolled in the course 65% of the time) and also taken the End-of-Course (EOCT) test. The EOCT is given towards the end of the course and by state board rule, the EOCT is a percentage of the final grade for the student. Therefore, the scenarios and reasoning are as follows:

1. Scenario: More students participating than students with valid proficiency score -
  - a. Reasoning: - Students are not FAY (did not meet the 65% enrollment rule)
  - b. Reasoning: - Semester course and students have not successfully completed both semesters and therefore has not taken the EOCT.
2. Scenario: More students with valid proficiency score than the number of students participating.
  - a. Reasoning: - Student met the FAY requirement and took the EOCT but did not complete the course and did not receive a final grade; therefore, was not expected to participate

### 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	20,730	20.08
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	52,103	50.48
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	21,051	20.39
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	9,339	9.05
Total	103,223	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Georgia, the state standardized assessment for high school students changed from the Georgia High School Graduation Test, to the End-Of-Course test. For students to be counted as participating, the student must have been enrolled in the course and received a final grade in the course. For students to be counted as having received a valid proficiency score, the student must have been FAY (enrolled in the course 65% of the time) and also taken the End-of-Course (EOCT) test. The EOCT is given towards the end of the course and by state board rule, the EOCT is a percentage of the final grade for the student. Therefore, the scenarios and reasoning are as follows:

1. Scenario: More students participating than students with valid proficiency score -
  - a. Reasoning: - Students are not FAY (did not meet the 65% enrollment rule)
  - b. Reasoning: - Semester course and students and have not successfully completed both semesters and therefore has have not taken the EOCT.
2. Scenario: More students with valid proficiency score than the number of students participating.
  - a. Reasoning: - Student met the FAY requirement and took the EOCT but did not complete the course and did not receive a final grade; therefore, was not expected to participate.

The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	871,086	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,825	98
Asian	S	30,456	>=99
Black or African American	S	324,158	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	103,735	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	384,898	>=99
Two or more races	S	26,014	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	101,240	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	48,627	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	517,051	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,883	>=99
Male	S	443,857	>=99
Female	S	427,229	>=99

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Georgia, the state standardized assessment for high school students changed from the Georgia High School Graduation Test, to the End-Of-Course test. For students to be counted as participating, the student must have been enrolled in the course and received a final grade in the course. For students to be counted as having received a valid proficiency score, the student must have been FAY (enrolled in the course 65% of the time) and also taken the End-of-Course (EOCT) test. The EOCT is given towards the end of the course and by state board rule, the EOCT is a percentage of the final grade for the student. Therefore, the scenarios and reasoning are as follows:

1. Scenario: More students participating than students with valid proficiency score -
  - a. Reasoning: - Students are not FAY (did not meet the 65% enrollment rule)
  - b. Reasoning: - Semester course and students have not successfully completed both semesters and therefore has not taken the EOCT.
2. Scenario: More students with valid proficiency score than the number of students participating.
  - a. Reasoning: - Student met the FAY requirement and took the EOCT but did not complete the course and did not receive a final grade; therefore, was not expected to participate.

The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

#### 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	1,598
--	-------

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	20,900	20.64
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	54,616	53.94
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	16,391	16.19
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	9,333	9.22
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	18	0.02
Total	101,258	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Georgia, the state standardized assessment for high school students changed from the Georgia High School Graduation Test, to the End-Of-Course test. For students to be counted as participating, the student must have been enrolled in the course and received a final grade in the course. For students to be counted as having received a valid proficiency score, the student must have been FAY (enrolled in the course 65% of the time) and also taken the End-of-Course (EOCT) test. The EOCT is given towards the end of the course and by state board rule, the EOCT is a percentage of the final grade for the student. Therefore, the scenarios and reasoning are as follows:

1. Scenario: More students participating than students with valid proficiency score -
  - a. Reasoning: - Students are not FAY (did not meet the 65% enrollment rule)
  - b. Reasoning: - Semester course and students have not successfully completed both semesters and therefore has not taken the EOCT.
2. Scenario: More students with valid proficiency score than the number of students participating.
  - a. Reasoning: - Student met the FAY requirement and took the EOCT but did not complete the course and did not receive a final grade; therefore, was not expected to participate.

The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	890,395	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,825	98
Asian	S	31,698	97
Black or African American	S	331,632	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	107,499	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	391,276	98
Two or more races	S	26,465	98
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	104,915	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	51,910	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	533,576	98
Migratory students	S	1,959	98
Male	S	455,006	98
Female	S	435,389	98

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Georgia, the state standardized assessment for high school students changed from the Georgia High School Graduation Test, to the End-Of-Course test. For students to be counted as participating, the student must have been enrolled in the course and received a final grade in the course. For students to be counted as having received a valid proficiency score, the student must have been FAY (enrolled in the course 65% of the time) and also taken the End-of-Course (EOCT) test. The EOCT is given towards the end of the course and by state board rule, the EOCT is a percentage of the final grade for the student. Therefore, the scenarios and reasoning are as follows:

1. Scenario: More students participating than students with valid proficiency score -
  - a. Reasoning: - Students are not FAY (did not meet the 65% enrollment rule)
  - b. Reasoning: - Semester course and students and have not successfully completed both semesters and therefore has have not taken the EOCT.
2. Scenario: More students with valid proficiency score than the number of students participating.
  - a. Reasoning: - Student met the FAY requirement and took the EOCT but did not complete the course and did not receive a final grade; therefore, was not expected to participate.

The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

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	22,701	21.64
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72,866	69.45
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		

Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	9,348	8.91
Total	104,915	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Georgia, the state standardized assessment for high school students changed from the Georgia High School Graduation Test, to the End-Of-Course test. For students to be counted as participating, the student must have been enrolled in the course and received a final grade in the course. For students to be counted as having received a valid proficiency score, the student must have been FAY (enrolled in the course 65% of the time) and also taken the End-of-Course (EOCT) test. The EOCT is given towards the end of the course and by state board rule, the EOCT is a percentage of the final grade for the student. Therefore, the scenarios and reasoning are as follows:

1. Scenario: More students participating than students with valid proficiency score -
    - a. Reasoning: - Students are not FAY (did not meet the 65% enrollment rule)
    - b. Reasoning: - Semester course and students and have not successfully completed both semesters and therefore has have not taken the EOCT.
  2. Scenario: More students with valid proficiency score than the number of students participating.
    - a. Reasoning: - Student met the FAY requirement and took the EOCT but did not complete the course and did not receive a final grade; therefore, was not expected to participate.
- The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	127,504	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	251	S	86
Asian	4,766	S	93
Black or African American	45,616	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	17,484	S	80
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,166	S	89
Two or more races	4,221	S	83
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,370	S	60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,961	S	78
Economically disadvantaged students	78,483	S	74
Migratory students	338	S	78
Male	65,347	S	79
Female	62,157	S	82

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	127,226	S	94
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	S	95
Asian	4,646	S	97
Black or African American	45,589	S	90
Hispanic or Latino	17,359	S	94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,161	S	97
Two or more races	4,219	S	96
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,376	S	83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,625	S	93
Economically disadvantaged students	78,279	S	92
Migratory students	333	S	92
Male	65,205	S	93
Female	62,021	S	96

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	127,419	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	S	84
Asian	4,762	S	91
Black or African American	45,588	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	17,475	S	77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,123	S	89
Two or more races	4,219	S	83
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,359	S	59
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,952	S	74
Economically disadvantaged students	78,432	S	70
Migratory students	337	S	72
Male	65,302	S	77
Female	62,117	S	80

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	127,271	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	S	83
Asian	4,578	S	93
Black or African American	45,963	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	17,139	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,208	S	88
Two or more races	4,120	S	83
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16,022	S	59
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,055	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	78,131	S	73
Migratory students	330	S	75
Male	65,199	S	79
Female	62,072	S	81

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	126,811	S	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	S	95
Asian	4,436	S	95
Black or African American	45,851	S	83
Hispanic or Latino	17,002	S	89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,149	S	95
Two or more races	4,110	S	92
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,867	S	73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,704	S	84
Economically disadvantaged students	77,801	S	86
Migratory students	326	S	84
Male	64,935	S	88
Female	61,876	S	92

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	127,198	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	262	S	84
Asian	4,574	S	91
Black or African American	45,947	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	17,141	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,159	S	90
Two or more races	4,115	S	85
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16,034	S	59
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,058	S	71
Economically disadvantaged students	78,096	S	74
Migratory students	329	S	73
Male	65,168	S	81
Female	62,030	S	81

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	130,282	S	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	S	94
Asian	4,648	S	96
Black or African American	48,407	S	84
Hispanic or Latino	16,712	S	91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,274	S	94
Two or more races	4,028	S	92
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16,461	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,623	S	85
Economically disadvantaged students	80,058	S	86
Migratory students	337	S	85
Male	66,607	S	88
Female	63,675	S	92
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers reported for the American Indian and the Migrant students are correct. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.			

### 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	129,975	S	95
American Indian or Alaska Native	212	S	97
Asian	4,536	S	96
Black or African American	48,360	S	92
Hispanic or Latino	16,600	S	95
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,242	S	98
Two or more races	4,025	S	97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16,432	S	84
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,338	S	90
Economically disadvantaged students	79,850	S	93
Migratory students	331	S	86
Male	66,434	S	94
Female	63,541	S	96
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers reported for the American Indian and the Migrant students are correct. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.			

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	130,152	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	S	85
Asian	4,645	S	90
Black or African American	48,370	S	67
Hispanic or Latino	16,704	S	75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,198	S	88
Two or more races	4,022	S	84
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16,457	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,618	S	60
Economically disadvantaged students	79,978	S	70
Migratory students	336	S	66
Male	66,548	S	77
Female	63,604	S	79
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers reported for the American Indian and the Migrant students are correct. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.			

#### 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	128,453	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	80
Asian	4,408	S	93
Black or African American	48,563	S	70
Hispanic or Latino	15,254	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,157	S	87
Two or more races	3,796	S	82
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,254	S	54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,254	S	65
Economically disadvantaged students	78,429	S	72
Migratory students	290	S	72
Male	65,801	S	77
Female	62,652	S	82

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

#### 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	128,108	S	95
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	S	95
Asian	4,319	S	97
Black or African American	48,470	S	93
Hispanic or Latino	15,130	S	95
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,127	S	97
Two or more races	3,789	S	97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,134	S	80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,986	S	89
Economically disadvantaged students	78,169	S	93
Migratory students	283	S	94
Male	65,601	S	94
Female	62,507	S	97

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	128,405	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	276	S	74
Asian	4,406	S	89
Black or African American	48,557	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	15,252	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,124	S	85
Two or more races	3,790	S	78
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,323	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,257	S	53
Economically disadvantaged students	78,410	S	63
Migratory students	289	S	65
Male	65,786	S	73
Female	62,619	S	73

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	125,521	S	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	279	S	94
Asian	4,251	S	95
Black or African American	46,812	S	85
Hispanic or Latino	14,289	S	91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,204	S	94
Two or more races	3,686	S	93
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,375	S	70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,631	S	79
Economically disadvantaged students	74,836	S	87
Migratory students	278	S	85
Male	64,130	S	88
Female	61,391	S	93

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	125,168	S	94
American Indian or Alaska Native	279	S	95
Asian	4,104	S	96
Black or African American	46,774	S	90
Hispanic or Latino	14,143	S	93
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,187	S	96
Two or more races	3,681	S	96
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,336	S	75
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,273	S	81
Economically disadvantaged students	74,586	S	91
Migratory students	273	S	85
Male	63,959	S	92
Female	61,209	S	96

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	125,360	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	279	S	89
Asian	4,252	S	92
Black or African American	46,746	S	77
Hispanic or Latino	14,278	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,127	S	91
Two or more races	3,678	S	90
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,373	S	58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,630	S	65
Economically disadvantaged students	74,718	S	79
Migratory students	278	S	73
Male	64,047	S	83
Female	61,313	S	86

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	124,930	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	280	S	85
Asian	4,413	S	94
Black or African American	47,372	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	13,491	S	85
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,009	S	91
Two or more races	3,365	S	88
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,149	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,690	S	70
Economically disadvantaged students	73,162	S	80
Migratory students	206	S	76
Male	63,577	S	84
Female	61,353	S	88

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	124,602	S	97
American Indian or Alaska Native	277	S	97
Asian	4,315	S	96
Black or African American	47,308	S	96
Hispanic or Latino	13,345	S	96
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,992	S	>=99
Two or more races	3,365	S	98
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,141	S	85
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,400	S	85
Economically disadvantaged students	72,923	S	96
Migratory students	199	S	92
Male	63,393	S	96
Female	61,209	S	98

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	124,573	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	279	S	74
Asian	4,407	S	87
Black or African American	47,215	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	13,424	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,893	S	85
Two or more races	3,355	S	81
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,114	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,677	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	72,890	S	64
Migratory students	206	S	55
Male	63,383	S	75
Female	61,190	S	74

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.

### 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	119,105	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	S	63
Asian	4,482	S	84
Black or African American	45,155	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	11,970	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	54,099	S	73
Two or more races	3,143	S	65
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,592	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,041	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	63,429	S	49
Migratory students	186	S	48
Male	59,916	S	60
Female	59,189	S	62
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2011-12 school year, Georgia changed the state standardized assessment for high school students from the Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHS GT) to the End-of-Course Assessments (EOCT) and the EOCT have more rigorous standards. Also note that the GHS GT was given to 11th graders only, whereas the EOCT for a course can be given in multiple grades. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.			

### 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	109,197	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	269	S	92
Asian	4,100	S	93
Black or African American	41,807	S	84
Hispanic or Latino	10,156	S	86
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	50,040	S	94
Two or more races	2,825	S	93
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,955	S	62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,301	S	62
Economically disadvantaged students	55,444	S	84
Migratory students	138	S	73
Male	54,331	S	87
Female	54,866	S	92
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 201-2012 school year, Georgia changed the state standardized assessment for high school students from the Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHS GT) to the End-of-Course Assessments (EOCT) and the EOCT have more rigorous standards. Also note that the GHS GT was given to 11th graders only whereas, the EOCT for a course can be given in multiple grades. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.			

### 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	127,288	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	264	S	77
Asian	4,652	S	86
Black or African American	49,209	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	13,225	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	56,652	S	85
Two or more races	3,286	S	81
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,255	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,718	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	71,052	S	63
Migratory students	184	S	55
Male	64,772	S	74
Female	62,516	S	73
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 201-2012 school year, Georgia changed the state standardized assessment for high school students from the Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHS GT) to the End-of-Course Assessments (EOCT) and the EOCT have more rigorous standards. Also note that the GHS GT was given to 11th graders only, whereas the EOCT for a course can be given in multiple grades. The Asian and the Pacific Islander ethnic category is reported as two separate categories for Georgia.</p>			

## 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	2,511		
Districts	219		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia was approved for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver in February 2012 as well as the Waiver of Requirements to Determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP); therefore, Georgia was not required to make AYP determinations for 2011-2012 school year.

### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,542		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,437		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	105		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia was approved for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver in February 2012 as well as the Waiver of Requirements to Determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP); therefore, Georgia was not required to make AYP determinations for 2011-2012 school year.

### 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
192		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia was approved for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver in February 2012 as well as the Waiver of Requirements to Determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP); therefore, Georgia was not required to make AYP determinations for 2011-2012 school year.

### 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	60
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data in this section is incorrect and will be corrected when the CSPR is reopened. The correct number is 62.	

### 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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	32
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data in this section is incorrect and will be corrected when the CSPR is reopened. The correct number is 32.	

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.

The goal of the Office of School Improvement is to design and implement a coherent and sustained statewide system of support and process for improvement, providing local education agencies and schools in Georgia with tools and resources, as well as intensive support for schools not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The School Keys: Unlocking Excellence through the Georgia School Standards is the foundation for Georgia's comprehensive, data-driven system of school improvement and support.

The Office of School Improvement works collaboratively with the regional support teams (RSTs). Support from the Office of School Improvement will be provided to all schools through the dissemination of key school improvement tools and resources. Regional learning sessions will occur to provide support system administrators, school administrators, and school leadership team members. Schools in Needs Improvement (NI) Status will be eligible to receive the support of a school improvement specialist.

Differentiated Accountability Plan: Georgia's Single Statewide Accountability System includes three classifications: Improvement Status (NI 1 and NI 2), Corrective Action Status (NI 3 and NI 4), and State-Directed Status (NI 5 and higher).

The Corrective Action Status also includes three tiers. These three tiers are based on the distance between the actual performance of subgroups that did meet AMOs in math and reading and the AMOs for those subjects in a given year.

These tiers are connected to a list of consequences that escalate from Tier 1 through Tier 3.

IMPROVEMENT STATUS (NI 1 and NI 2)

1. Notify parents of each student enrolled in the school of the school's NI status.

2. Revise and implement the school improvement plan.

3. Provide Supplemental Educational Services (SES) for all students who are not meeting standards in reading, English/language arts, and/or math.

4. Offer Public School Choice to all students at schools in NI 2 or higher.

\*Note: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) consequences for schools entering NI 1 in 2009 or subsequent years can be flipped at the discretion of the LEA:

- This means that SES could be offered in NI 1 schools first, as opposed to Public School Choice.

- Schools in NI 1 prior to 2009 are still required to offer Public School Choice rather than until they make AYP for two consecutive years.

Both SES and Public School Choice are still required for all schools in NI 2 or higher. STATE-DIRECTED STATUS (NI 5 and HIGHER)

1. Notify parents of each enrolled student of the school's classification.

2. Provide Supplemental Educational Services (SES) for all students who are not meeting standards in reading, English/language arts, and/or math.

3. Offer Public School Choice to all students at the school.

4. The LEA must enter into an annual state - directed improvement contract with terms and conditions directed by the GaDOE.

Non-Negotiable Contract Elements

GaDOE school improvement specialist assigned to the school to provide direct supervision in the implementation of all school improvement actions:

- Directly involved in decisions regarding replacement of staff (e.g., principal).

- Ensures that instructional frameworks are used appropriately in each classroom.

- Ensures benchmark assessments are given and results are analyzed to guide instruction.

- Oversees implementation of short-term action plans.

- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes teacher attendance and develops action plan if needed.

- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes student attendance and develops action plan if needed.

- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes discipline records and develops action plan if needed.

- Ensures that the leadership team addresses targeted areas from the GAPSS review through the short-term action plans. Other Mandates for State-Directed Schools

- Participate in a GAPSS review at NI 5, NI 7, and NI 9.

- Provide training, implementation and monitoring of school improvement strategies.

- Hire instructional coaches for specific content area of need based on AYP

results. Customized Contract Expectations

In addition to the set of non-negotiable actions, a set of customized expectations will be developed annually by the state with each school and system to address the unique issues that the school faces in the coming school year. These expectations will be based on the most recent school data analysis available.

CORRECTIVE ACTION STATUS (NI 3 and NI 4)

TIER 1 CORRECTIVE ACTION STATUS (NI 3 and NI 4)

School placement in the three possible tiers is based on the distance from the AMOs by subject and subgroup(s) that failed.

1. Notify parents of each enrolled student enrolled in the school of the school's NI status.
2. Provide Supplemental Educational Services (SES) for all students who are not meeting standards in reading, English/language arts, and/or math.
3. Offer Public School Choice to all students at the school.
4. Update and implement the school improvement plan with the GaDOE.
5. Complete a corrective action plan (LEA responsibility).

The LEA must choose and implement of the following corrective actions based on student achievement and school data:

- Extend the school year or school day for the school.
- Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.
- Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making AYP based on its improvement plan.

Convert the school to a charter school.

#### TIER 2 CORRECTIVE ACTION STATUS (NI 3 and NI 4)

School placement in the three possible tiers is based on the distance from the AMOs by subject and subgroup(s) that failed.

1. Notify parents of each student enrolled in the school of the school's NI status.
  2. Provide Supplemental Educational Services (SES) for all students who are not meeting standards in reading, English/language arts, and/or math.
  3. Offer Public School Choice to all students at the school.
  4. Update and implement the school improvement plan.
  5. Complete a corrective action plan (LEA responsibility). The LEA must choose and implement one of the following corrective actions based on student achievement and school data:
    - Replace the school staff that are relevant to the failure to make adequate yearly progress.
    - Significantly decrease management authority at the school level.
    - Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making adequate yearly progress, based on its improvement plan.
- Extend the school year or school day for the school. · Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

Convert the school to a charter school.

#### TIER 3 CORRECTIVE ACTION STATUS (NI 3 and NI 4)

School placement in the three possible tiers is based on the distance from the AMOs by subject and subgroup(s) that failed.

1. Notify parents of each enrolled student in the school of the school's NI status.
2. Provide Supplemental Educational Services (SES) for all students who are not meeting standards in reading, English/language arts, and/or math.
3. Offer Public School Choice to all students at the school.
4. Update and implement the school improvement plan to include all corrective actions(s) as selected by the GaDOE based on school needs.
5. Complete a corrective action plan (GaDOE responsibility).

The GaDOE chooses one or more corrective action that the LEA must implement based on student achievement and school data.

- GaDOE involved directly in decisions regarding the replacement of the school staff that are relevant to the failure to make AYP, or Significantly decrease management authority at the school level, or Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making AYP, based on its improvement plan, or Extend the school year or school day for the school, or Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school, or Convert to a charter school

**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	37
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia was approved for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver in February 2012 as well as the Waiver of Requirements to Determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP); therefore, Georgia was not required to make AYP determinations for 2011-2012 school year.		

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

**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*: 1.00%

**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 evaluation and technical assistance activities conducted during SY2011-12 included the provision of assigned school improvement specialists in each of the schools receiving 1003(g) funds. The school improvement specialists provided guidance and support in the implementation of their school improvement grant in order to meet assurances and identified targets. Professional development was provided for SIG coordinators, principals, instructional coaches, graduation coaches and school leadership teams. Further, professional learning opportunities were provided to the school improvement specialists to ensure quality in the delivery of the services and support to the schools. Quarterly monitoring and evaluation of the program/initiatives of 1003(g) funded schools was conducted by lead school improvement specialists. An annual performance review was completed at the end of the school year to evaluate the progress for each of the schools.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Board of Education (SBOE) maintains an approved Single Statewide Accountability System with awards and consequences. This system is described in detail in SBOE Rule 160-7-1.01. This and other Board rules related to federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requirements may be reviewed on the GaDOE website, <http://www.gadoe.org/>.

In February 2012, the US Department of Education granted a waiver to Georgia to implement revised supports and rewards. The goal of the Office of School Improvement is to design and implement a coherent and sustained statewide system of support and process for improvement, providing local education agencies and schools in Georgia with tools and resources, as well as intensive support for identified as Priority Schools, Focus Schools, or Alert Schools. Schools identified through the waiver receive the support of a school improvement specialist.

Priority Schools and Focus Schools engage in a Memorandum of Agreement with the GaDOE. The following are the non-negotiable components in the MOA and all activities are supported by the assigned school improvement specialist:

- Directly involved in decisions regarding replacement of staff (e.g., principal).
- Ensures that instructional frameworks are used appropriately in each classroom.
- Ensures benchmark assessments are given and results are analyzed to guide instruction.
- Oversees implementation of short-term action plans.
- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes teacher attendance and develops action plan if needed.
- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes student attendance and develops action plan if needed.
- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes discipline records and develops action plan if needed.
- Participate in a GAPSS
- Ensures that the leadership team addresses targeted areas from the GAPSS review through the short-term action plans.
- Provide training, implementation and monitoring of school improvement strategies.

In addition to the set of non-negotiable actions, a set of customized expectations may be developed annually by the state with each school and system to address the unique issues that the school faces in the coming school year. These expectations will be based on the most recent school data analysis available.

In addition to focusing on work at the school level, the GaDOE has developed a process to work with districts in building capacity to support the schools within the district. The district effectiveness initiative is focused on providing expertise in implementing the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards and shifting to performance assessments aligned with the new standards.

## 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

#### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	140,409
Applied to transfer	5,586
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	4,205
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 10,111,899

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	56

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	38,155
Applied for supplemental educational services	30,251
Received supplemental educational services	19,809
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 20,702,231
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	287,467	283,404	98.59	4,063	1.41
All elementary classes	99,699	98,716	99.01	983	0.99
All secondary classes	187,768	184,688	98.36	3,080	1.64

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Both are used in elementary school. Some schools have departmentalized math, science, social studies, and reading with different teachers teaching different content. Others have one teacher teaching all the content.
---

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	10.00
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	87.80
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	1.20
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comment from the Professional Standards Commission which the teacher certifying agency responsible for determining Highly Qualified. "Other in this case is entirely made up of what we call ambiguous coded records. These are records which were pulled from CPI but our system was unable to determine what the educator was actually doing for credential verification. Systems are given 6 months to correct."

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	10.20
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	84.80
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.10
Other (please explain in comment box below)	4.90
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comment from the Professional Standards Commission which the teacher certifying agency responsible for determining Highly Qualified. "Other in this case is entirely made up of what we call ambiguous coded records. These are records which were pulled from CPI but our system was unable to determine what the educator was actually doing for credential verification. Systems are given 6 months to correct."

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	27,940	27,505	98.44
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	27,311	27,142	99.38
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	29,582	28,575	96.60
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	63,566	62,831	98.84

#### 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	80.50	45.50
Poverty metric used	Data collected in the annual Free and Reduced Data Collection	
Secondary schools	80.60	45.40
Poverty metric used	Data collected in the annual Free and Reduced Data Collection	

**FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty**

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
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.

A large percentage of LEAs utilize the Push-In model in addition to other models, which allows the ESOL teacher to enter the regular education classroom and work directly with ELs, providing targeted language support within the content area classroom. A significant number of LEAs have provided SIOP training to teachers to ensure that academic content material taught in the general education classroom is comprehensible to ELs, promoting English language development, along with content area proficiency. SIOP training provides teachers with a well articulated and practical method of sheltered instruction to facilitate high quality instruction for ELs in content areas. Although dual language programs are not widely implemented in Georgia at this time, the number of programs is slowly increasing. Dual language programs have been developed and implemented both in charter schools and traditional public schools in Georgia and as these programs expand, other LEAs are expressing interest in pursuing the implementation of dual language as a program model.

## 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	90,595
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	78,672
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	70,638
No linguistic content; Not applicable	5,235
Vietnamese	2,518
Korean	1,718
Chinese	1,405

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category "No linguistic content" listed above as the second most commonly spoken language represents Georgia LEP students who speak languages categorized as "Other African", "Other Asian", "Other Indian", "Other European". The Georgia master language code individually lists the primary languages in each group spoken by Georgia LEP students, but does not separately list every individual language within those categories. Other major language groups represented in Georgia are French, Arabic, Amharic, Gujarati, Haitian Creole and Portuguese.

### 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).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	84,667
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,928
Total	90,595
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All K12 English Learners, coded EL-Y (LEP-Y), and enrolled in a Georgia school at any time during the 2011-12 school year are included in the total count of Title III ILEP students tested on the annual state ELP assessment. Students are coded EL-Y (LEP-Y) upon determination of eligibility and remain coded as such until their status changes to EL-M (LEP-M). ACCESS for ELLs is the annual ELP assessment. In Georgia, this assessment is administered during a specific testing window between late January and the beginning of March (1/17/12-3/2/12).</p> <p>Students who enter Georgia schools outside the ACCESS testing window dates are reported as EL-Y upon screening and meeting eligibility requirements; however, if they were not enrolled during the ELP assessment testing window, the ACCESS cannot be administered to them. Because the population can be highly mobile, a significant number of ELs may withdraw and move to another state before the testing window opens or enroll after the testing window has ended, yet still be included in the total count of LEP students in the state for the school year.</p> <p>The number tested on the annual ELP assessment includes all LEP students who participated in one or more domains of the assessment. This number includes students with disabilities of a nature that may have prevented their participation in all domains of the assessment. This includes students who are blind and unable to see a picture and describe it for the speaking or writing domains or students who are deaf or whose hearing is so severely impaired that they are not able to respond to oral questions in the listening domain.</p> <p>There is a very small population of students in the state who by the nature and severity of their disabilities are unable to participate in any domain of the assessment. These students are included in the count of students not tested on the State annual ELP assessment. Students whose student booklets indicated they were absent for one or more domains of the assessment and students who moved out of state without completing the entire assessment, as well as students who formally withdrew from school and did not enroll in another Georgia district during the ELP assessment window also were included in the total.</p>	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13,730
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.22
<p><b>Comments:</b> 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.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	74,016
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,656
Total	78,672
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All Title III K-2 English Learners, coded EL-Y, and enrolled in a Georgia school at any time during the 2011-12 school year are included in the total count of Title III ILEP students tested on the annual state ELP assessment. Students are coded EL-Y (LEP-Y) upon determination of eligibility and remain coded as such until their status changes to EL-M (LEP-M). ACCESS for ELLs is the annual ELP assessment. In Georgia, this assessment is administered during a specific testing window between late January and the beginning of March (1/17/12-3/2/12).</p> <p>Students who enter Georgia schools outside the ACCESS testing window dates are reported as EL-Y upon screening and meeting eligibility requirements; however, if they were not enrolled during the ELP assessment testing window, the ACCESS cannot be administered to them. Because the population can be highly mobile, a significant number of ELs may withdraw and move to another state before the testing window opens or enroll after the testing window has ended, yet still be included in the total count of LEP students in the state for the school year.</p> <p>The number tested on the annual ELP assessment includes all LEP students who participated in one or more domains of the assessment. This number includes students with disabilities of a nature that may have prevented their participation in all domains of the assessment. This includes students who are blind and unable to see a picture and describe it for the speaking or writing domains or students who are deaf or whose hearing is so severely impaired that they are not able to respond to oral questions in the listening domain.</p> <p>There is a very small population of students in the state who by the nature and severity of their disabilities are unable to participate in any domain of the assessment. These students are included in the count of students not tested on the State annual ELP assessment. Students whose student booklets indicated they were absent for one or more domains of the assessment and students who moved out of state without completing the entire assessment, as well as students who formally withdrew from school and did not enroll in another Georgia district during the ELP assessment window also were included in the total.</p>	

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).

	#
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.	21,369

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

#### **Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	35,713	67.83	26,849	51.00
Attained proficiency	9,245	12.49	4,996	6.80
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	___ No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	___ No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	___ No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia provides testing of academic content knowledge in English only.	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
None
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not administer native language assessments for <i>ESEA</i> accountability for mathematics.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
None
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not administer native language assessments for ESEA accountability for reading/language arts.</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)
None
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not administer native language assessments for ESEA accountability for 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
11,995	12,743	24,738
<b>Comments:</b> 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
19,814	S	86	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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
19,772	S	97	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
19,302	S	84	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	90
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	36
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	90
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	89
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	54
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	5
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	4

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. Georgia has a single state-wide consortium comprised in 2011-12 of 75 LEAs reporting ELs but with a population too small to qualify for individual Title III allocations. The 75 districts are located geographically throughout the entire state. The Georgia Title III Consortium is considered a single subgrantee and AMAOs 1 and 2 are calculated for the consortium as a single entity. AMAO 3 is calculated individually for each LEA within the consortium. In 2011-12 no LEA within the consortium had a qualifying subgroup for AMAO 3 calculations. Reporting any LEA with "too few for subgroup" as not meeting AMAO 3 would unjustly penalize the LEA because of its small demographic population; therefore, Georgia LEAs with "too few for subgroup" designations are considered to meet AMAO 3.

#### 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	No Response
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia was approved for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver in February 2012 as well as the Waiver of Requirements to Determine Yearly Progress (AYP); therefore, Georgia was not required to make AYP determinations for the 2011-12 school year. In prior years, AMAO-3 distinctions were produced through the AYP process. Additionally, GaDOE is transitioning from the use of the Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHS GT) to the End-of-Course Tests (EOCTs) which facilitates the need for a new definition of Full Academic Year (FAY) Students. The new FAY definition and final FAY status were finalized and calculated during the months of February and March 2013.</p>	

#### 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?	___No_
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
18,290	5,175	50

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.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,040
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	325

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.

Despite the current economic recession in Georgia, the EL K-12 population in the state increased almost 3% from 2011-12 to 2012-13. While fewer new families are moving into Georgia for work reasons at this time, Georgia is a designated key refugee location center and therefore, will continue to experience annual increases in the EL student population. Additionally, the largest population of ELs entering Georgia public schools is at the Kindergarten level; many of Georgia's future public school LEP students are born in the United States, a number of them in Georgia. This trend is expected to continue as children of families who have made their homes in Georgia reach school age and enroll in local schools. The estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers needed for Title III language instruction is based on the expectation that the total EL student population will continue to grow by approximately 3% per year or approximately 12,000 students over the next five years. Additionally, more LEAs are incorporating sheltered content instruction classes for ELs into local school schedules to better serve the academic needs of EL students. The number of additional certified/licensed teachers, 325, resulted from dividing 12,000 new students by 42, the number of students the state funding formula anticipates being assigned to a teacher, as well as replacing the ESOL teacher positions lost in the past year due to extreme budget cuts at the district level. Georgia Department of Education Title III and Title I programs have collaborated for several years to offer on-line ESOL Endorsement opportunities to districts in rural areas as availability of endorsement programs is often limited to the more populous areas of the state. A number of the larger school districts and Regional Education Service Agencies (RESAs) also offer ESOL training as part of their professional learning programs. Several state universities offer either the ESOL Endorsement or full ESOL teacher certification programs.

\* 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	66	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	64	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	65	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	60	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	57	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	35	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	67	40,396
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	68	3,988
PD provided to principals	64	1,466
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	64	1,782
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	63	4,865
PD provided to community based organization personnel	38	1,672
Total	364	54,169

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other" category encompasses subgrantees that had teachers or administrators enrolled in the Georgia ESOL Endorsement course sequence offered in an approved program through their local school district, a Regional Education Services Agency (RESA) or a college or university. It also includes subgrantees that offered SIOP training, and a variety of other topics related to ELs, including Common Core Georgia Performance Standards training, vertical alignment of K-12 academic content, increasing student engagement, differentiation for ELs, supporting teachers of ELs with disabilities, awareness and respect for cultural differences, RTI with a specific focus on ELs, literacy strategies, record keeping requirements for language assistance programs, and collaborative teaching with ELs in the content classroom.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/7/11	8/10/11	33
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Georgia State Board of Education approves all grant awards to local school systems. The Georgia Department of Education Title III Unit received its initial notification of the Title III allocation from the ED Title III Program Officer on July 7, 2011. State Board of Education procedures do not permit approval of allocations prior to receipt of the exact dollar amount of the allocation. The Georgia SBOE met on August 10, 2011 and approved the grant awards as part of the meeting agenda.		

### 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.

Georgia Department of Education Title III Unit has taken a proactive approach, preparing an item for information for the State Board of Education prior to receiving the grant award. This is not standard operating procedure and does not guarantee that grant funds will be made available more quickly, but does ensure that the State Board of Education has all pertinent information regarding the Title III grant and will be ready to approve the item at their first meeting following receipt of the grant award. Funds may not be distributed until formal approval of the amount is granted by the State Board of Education.

**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	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	152	152
LEAs with subgrants	44	44
Total	196	196
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	163	451
K	689	3,015
1	649	2,784
2	625	2,576
3	597	2,502
4	541	2,466
5	504	2,276
6	509	2,188
7	502	2,051
8	422	2,010
9	368	2,237
10	248	1,451
11	181	961
12	204	931
Ungraded		
Total	6,202	27,899

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not have ungraded grade levels in public schools.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	394	3,526
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	5,258	19,976
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	113	458
Hotels/Motels	437	3,939
Total	6,202	27,899

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not have ungraded grade levels in public schools.

## 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	10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	636
K	3,585
1	3,294
2	3,102
3	3,014
4	2,915
5	2,704
6	2,620
7	2,506
8	2,368
9	2,554
10	1,680
11	1,128
12	1,128
Ungraded	
Total	33,244

**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.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,848
Migratory children/youth	208
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,130
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,406

**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	2,392	2,071
4	2,274	1,868
5	2,126	1,918
6	2,062	1,873
7	1,921	1,690
8	1,840	1,747
High School	1,057	847

**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	2,396	1,502
4	2,285	1,500
5	2,131	1,687
6	2,070	1,341
7	1,922	1,607
8	1,847	1,350
High School	1,272	540

**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	2,395	1,479
4	2,282	1,565
5	2,124	1,341
6	2,061	1,170
7	1,918	1,413
8	1,834	1,067
High School	1,482	815

**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)	1,032
K	982
1	553
2	543
3	464
4	412
5	410
6	387
7	361
8	303
9	304
10	227
11	191
12	215
Ungraded	43
Out-of-school	2,589
Total	9,016
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The increase is less than 10%.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	275
K	350
1	221
2	196
3	159
4	145
5	142
6	94
7	57
8	36
9	51
10	34
11	26
12	3
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	11
Total	1,808
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The increase of 10.92% over the prior year is due to our continued focus on identifying students needing services and providing those services in local school districts. Planning for summer services began in early 2012 and our Implementation Plan process allowed us to ensure proper coding of those participants served by Migrant funds during this time frame. These implementation plans also provided accountability for our school districts to ensure summer services occurred for each participant in need. Our state run summer programs were expanded to include more students during this time frame. Our migrant consortium of smaller school districts, with Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College as the fiscal agent, initiated a new summer program for middle school students during this time frame.

**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.

COEstar was used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. The child counts for the last reporting period were also generated using the COEstar system.

### 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.

Note: This information pertains to both the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Upon enrollment in the Migrant Education Program (MEP), information from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is entered into COEstar by a trained Georgia Department of Education migrant regional data specialist.

Data on the COE include all required data elements and required sections of the national COE: (1) Family data (parent/guardian name(s), family language, current address, and home base)

(2) Child data (name, sex, race, date of birth, birthplace, school, grade, and school enrollment date)

(3) Eligibility data (where moved from, where moved to, with/to join or on his/her own move, date of move, qualifying worker, qualifying activity, employer, whether work is seasonal or temporary, whether work is agricultural or fishing related, whether move was for economic necessity)

(4) Residency date

(5) Comments explaining migrant work history and qualifying activity as identified in the eligibility section

(6) Other data (previous school enrollments,

etc.) (7) Parent/Guardian and recruiter signatures

All of the above information is obtained through a face-to-face interview with the family/self-eligible youth, generally at their residence or workplace by a trained regional office recruiter/employee or a trained local education agency (LEA) migrant staff person. Occasionally, the family interview occurs when parents come to the school to register their children. In all cases, the COE is completed and submitted to the appropriate regional office for processing. COEs are completed on each new family/self-eligible youth identified by the recruiter/employee or LEA staff during the initial interview. Identification and recruitment (ID&R) activities are carried out year round. Occasionally, ID&R activities are conducted as a part of other regional or LEA activities, e.g. summer festivals, migrant health fairs.

Each summer or intersession term, the LEA forwards a report to the regional GaDOE office containing the names of eligible migrant children or youth who received services (instructional or support) at least one day during the summer or intersession term. The data regarding the particulars of the services are reviewed and verified by state MEP staff (adolescent outreach specialist or resource specialist) prior to being entered into the individual student's information/school history line in COEstar by the regional data specialists.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state employs a full-time MEP state data collections coordinator, and two full-time state data specialists. The three state regional offices each have their own full-time data specialists. The primary responsibility of the state data collections coordinator and team is to maintain/monitor the statewide data system and data collection process, update the data in COEstar and the national migrant student information exchange (MSIX) system, as well as generate reports and queries as requested by the state and the LEAs.

Every day, the data specialists from each of the three regional offices send electronic copies of their COEstar database to a state data specialist (each regional office has a complete statewide copy of the COEstar database). The state data specialist synchronizes each copy, running checks to identify and catch any duplication, errors, and/or missing data. If problems with the data are detected, the state data specialist sends an e-mail to the appropriate MEA data specialist, the appropriate MEA regional coordinator, and the state data collections coordinator, explaining the problem or concern. When the MEA data specialist has corrected the problem or addressed the concern, she sends a secure e-mail with the corrections to inform the state data specialist, the MEA coordinator, and the state data collections coordinator that the problematic data have been corrected, if applicable. When this review process is complete, the state data specialist then uploads an updated, corrected copy of the COEstar database to each MEA data specialist.

Because each regional MEA office and the state data collections office have complete copies of the COEstar

database, many errors and duplicates are caught at the regional level. Each month the state data collections coordinator prepares a performance report to provide an overview of every aspect of the COEstar database for the state program director. If the state program director sees any problems, these are communicated by e-mail to the state data collections coordinator for resolution.

To eliminate duplicates, the State follows these steps when inputting data in to our system:

- When reviewing a COE in COEstar, the regional data specialist completes a search in the database using the individual's name, DOB, gender, and mother's maiden name. The system automatically shows names with similar spellings. The system will also show names with similar dates.
- A list of possible matches is generated.
- The top 100 matches are reviewed to determine if it is the same person or different. Old COEs are also included and reviewed in this matching process.
- If the search reveals the individual on the COE already has a COE, we use the original COE ID# on the new COE.
- If it is a different person, we create a COEstar generated ID number for this participant.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for both counts were collected and maintained using the same set of procedures. Although Category 2 data are collected and maintained in the same way as Category 1, the State provides training annually to all migrant staff on what allowable services may be appropriately associated with the Category 2 count. Such training focuses on ensuring that only services that meet the U. S. Department of Education's definition are those associated with the child count. The services data are also reviewed by data specialists for appropriateness before the data are entered into the COEstar system.

### 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.

The Georgia Department of Education Migrant Education Program uses the following processes to calculate each child count:

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).

Response: COEstar is programmed to produce a count based on all the eligibility criteria contained in the federal statute. In order to ensure that the residency dates for 3 yr olds occurs after the child has turned 3, the state runs the Three Year Old report from our COEstar database the month after the participant turns three. LEAs are responsible for ensuring that students on the list are present and being served. This is verified during the state's annual sub-grantee monitoring process. Preschool is an individual category on the state's monitoring tool.

Children who were resident in your State for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/1-8/31).

Response: COEstar's Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely

show that the child resided in the state during the period. These include checking the school year listed on school enrollment records, the qualifying arrival date (QAD, residency dates, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, departure dates, LEP, needs assessment, graduation/termination dates, special services dates, and health record dates performed in the state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if departure dates indicate that they left before the period began, or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the state when the period began.

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

Response: Each summer or intersession term, the local project director forwards a report to the regional MEA office containing the number of eligible migrant children or youth who received services (instructional or support) at least one day during the summer or intersession term. The data regarding the particulars of the services are entered into the individual student's information/school history line in COEstar.

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

Response: The state data collections coordinator runs COEstar's Performance Reporter, which has a number of programmed interventions to count migrant children only once, state wide, for the period specified in the state data collections coordinator query. Some of these interventions include checking names that are the same or similar, checking the maiden name of the child's mother, and checking the date and place of birth, the QAD, etc.

In order to eliminate duplicate entries, the State issues each participant a unique identifier through our database,

COEstar. The State follows this process to check for duplicates:

- When reviewing a COE in COEstar, the regional data specialist completes a search in the database using the individual's name, DOB, gender, and mother's maiden name. The system automatically shows names with similar spellings. The system will also show names with similar dates.
- A list of possible matches is generated.
- The top 100 matches are reviewed to determine if it is the same person or different. Old COEs are also included and reviewed in this matching process.
- If the search reveals the individual on the COE already has a COE, we use the original COE ID# on the new COE
  - If it is a different person, we create a COEstar generated ID number for this participant.

The State Data Collections coordinator responds to all potential duplicates in MSIX. She reviews each instance, compares

it to the COE information in our database, and makes corrections as needed. The state data coordinator or state data specialist will contact the family and request a copy of the birth certificate in some cases. If the records are duplicates, we check our database to determine if a duplicate is present. If it is, we will merge it in our database. It will then merge in MSIX on the next upload.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count was generated using the same system as the Category 1 count.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

It is the goal of the Georgia MEP to achieve and maintain 100% accuracy in its recruiting processes. Important quality control steps and processes have been implemented in recent years at the regional and state levels to improve the GaDOE's ability to ensure and verify the accuracy of eligibility determinations prior to or immediately after entering eligibility information in the COEstar system.

#### Ongoing Recruiter Training

All MEA and LEA migrant staff members are provided mandatory ID&R training, where agendas and sign-in sheets are maintained, throughout the year. Topics include:

- The Migrant Education Program
- The Identification and Recruitment Handbook
- How to Apply the Eligibility Section of the Non-Regulatory Guidance
- The Role of Recruitment
- How to Conduct Interviews
- How to Fill Out a COE
- Effective Recruitment Techniques
- Building Recruitment Networks
- How to Resolve Difficult Recruitment Cases
- Records Maintenance/Documentation

All program staff members (including LEA migrant funded staff) are required to attend these training sessions. They are required to pass a series of assessments to certify their understanding of the state's recruiting policies and guidelines. Passing scores are mandatory in order to receive a satisfactory annual evaluation from program administrators. All state fulltime recruiters are required to meet at least once every quarter with the state ID&R coordinator to review any change in guidelines, discuss policies and procedures, and to discuss and resolve difficult or ambiguous recruitment cases. All newly hired recruiting staff, whether at the local or state level, participates in an initial three day recruitment training session prior to beginning any recruitment effort for the state. All new recruiters also have all their paperwork fully screened by an experienced recruiter until they successfully complete at least ten enrollments with no errors that would require follow up with the families.

#### Certificate of Eligibility (COE) Processing

Statewide uniformity at the regional office (MEA) level in processing COEs for data system entry is as follows: MEA and local recruiters/employee recruit families or youth by completing a COE during a face-to-face interview.

Written information recorded during the interview is verbally reviewed by the recruiter/employee for accuracy.

The recruiter/employee then signs the form and asks the interviewee to sign, as well.

The pink copy is immediately given to the interviewee as a record of the (eligibility) initial identification interview.

The original copy (white), along with the recruiter or LEA copy (yellow) go to the regional data specialist.

The COE is date stamped by the data specialist upon arrival at the regional MEA office.

The MEA data specialist reviews the COE for completion to ensure that all boxes are marked and that the COE is filled out according to the state's completion instructions as described in the GaDOE MEP ID&R Handbook (2011 Edition). If the COE meets all of the necessary criteria, the data specialist initials it in the top right hand corner. It is then given to the regional MEA office coordinator for final review and approval.

If the data specialist sees that an item is missing or believes that an item needs clarification, she contacts the original recruiter who conducted the interview. The recruiter will correct and provide additional comments that clarify the issue. The recruiter is required to contact the family for any additional information or if changes are made on the form. The parent/guardian is required to initial and date changes if QAD information is missing. A data specialist can correct and initial spelling mistakes without having to notify the recruiter or family/youth. If critical information, QAD and/or signature, is missing, or if information conflicts with previous information on file, the COE is referred back to the original recruiter.

The Data Specialist maintains a file of COEs with errors. This assists the state in monitoring errors as they arise. The regional office is responsible for (1) resolving outstanding issues/discrepancies and (2) providing feedback and training to

individual recruiters as the need arises.

All COEs receive regional MEA office coordinator verification and approval prior to being entered into the COEstar system. A signature line is included on the original and yellow copy of the COE for this purpose.

After errors and discrepancies are resolved and the coordinator has signed off, the information on the COE is entered into the COEstar system.

The original COE (white) and the electronic COE are maintained at the regional MEA office. The yellow copy is sent to be filed at the LEA or Consortium state office.

Two COEstar generated notifications or "Friendly COE" forms are mailed to the LEA, together with the yellow copy, after COE approval to provide systems with basic program eligibility information, and for the system to notify the family.

The data specialists and recruiters/employees work as a team. They consult with each other to resolve issues and answer questions that may arise. If there are issues that the data specialists and recruiters/employees are unable to resolve independently, they will consult with the regional MEA office coordinators immediately to resolve the issues. Any issues, which the region is unable to resolve independently, are referred to the state ID & R coordinator. If at any time the state ID & R coordinator is unable to answer the question, it is referred to the Migrant Education Office within the United States Department of Education in Washington, DC for assistance.

Should a question arise from any source regarding an eligibility determination made on a child, the state takes action on the question or concern by requesting a re-interview. The form that is utilized is the same as that used in the random sample prospective re-interview process and is available from the State MEP Data Collections Office. The process for evaluating the eligibility determination follows that of the prospective re-interview process. The state, itself, is solely responsible for reviewing and monitoring the quality of its migrant student eligibility documentation as it relates to the annual child count, including student eligibility data related to attendance in regular year and summer/intersession projects. All eligibility decisions are finalized and made by the coordinator in each of the state's regional MEA offices prior to the delivery of any MEP services. Every child's eligibility documentation is included for selection in the random sample process associated with the quality control efforts of the state's prospective re-interviews.

Enrollment information for students attending summer and intersession programs is collected by the LEA and provided to the GaDOE regional office. During statewide training, LEAs are instructed how and when to report this information to the regional data specialist. This information is in our Data Reporting Resource Guide. The three regional data specialists are trained by the State Data Collections Coordinator on the procedures for reviewing and inputting summer and intersession data. This training happens in the spring of each year and is conducted face-to-face.

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.

#### I. Paperwork Preparation and Staff Assignment Process

State Data Collections Office generates random samples on quarterly basis. Once COEs are sampled for selected time period:

- MEA data specialists photocopy each original COE selected. She completes verification form top section. COE copy is placed in envelope and sealed. The outside of the envelope is marked with information deemed necessary for re-interviewer to see prior to conducting the interview (E.g. COE number, re-interviewee name, prior move, etc). Verification form is attached to the envelope and is given to regional MEA coordinator for dissemination to re-interviewers.
- The regional MEA coordinator selects the most appropriate re-interviewer (regional MEA recruiter) for the verification of eligibility interview. Verification will be done by a trained re-interviewer different than the original interviewer.
- MEA data specialist maintains log of who is in charge of completing the verification of each COE.

#### II. Conducting the Verification Process in the Field

All eligibility re-interviewing MUST be done through face-to-face interview with original interviewee. Re-interviewers give priority to scheduling summer school students during the summer quarter. On verification day, reinterviewer can be accompanied by another recruiter or LEA staff member to assist in locating families. If that individual was the original interviewer, he or she must return to or remain in the car prior to and/or during the re-interview. Re-interviewer completing verification will explain why quality control measure is taking place. Each verification form field must be completed. If one field does not apply, N/A notation will be used. Re-interviewer is free to paraphrase any of the questions to clarify question meaning, but must not use leading questions. COE paper copy will be in a sealed envelope, with relevant info on the outside. COE copy is available for verification purposes. The re-interviewer should open the sealed envelope only after the re-interview is complete to cross check it with the re-interview data, and ask any needed follow-up questions. At the end of the visit, the re-interviewer will review verification form data with interviewee, date, and sign it along with the interviewee.

If interviewee is unable to sign, a witnessed mark can take the place of signature. If interviewee refuses to sign, re-interviewer will make notation of it and reason, if any is given. Lack of a signature will have no impact on eligibility or ineligibility, verification will still be considered valid. If it is determined that a family has departed, the re-interviewer will document who provided the information. Re-interviewer will sign and date verification form. If the re-interviewer finds an interviewee not at home, he or she will make at least three attempts to locate or meet with individual. Each attempt will take place at different dates and hours of day and each one will be documented in verification form top section. After third attempt, re-interviewer will circle last visit documentation notation. Re-interviewer will enter comment such as: "3 attempts-unable to locate," on parent's signature space. Re-interviewer will sign and date the verification form. Re-interviewer will have ten days after the end of re-interview period to deliver completed forms to regional MEA coordinator. Regional MEA coordinator will review each eligibility verification form to ensure each one is complete and accurate. MEA coordinator will discuss any questions or incomplete information with re-interviewer.

### III. Completing Final Paperwork

MEA data specialist will use regional electronic spreadsheet contained in the state's "Quarterly Quality Control" (QCC) Excel document to enter re-interviews results. Information will be entered for each COE used. This Excel document will be sent electronically to state ID&R coordinator and state data collections coordinator by the first Friday of the month after QQC took place. The regional data specialists will compile a folder that contains following documents:

- Hard copy of the "Quarterly Quality Control" Excel document, as cover page
- Photocopies of each verified paper COEs attached to back of its respective verification form Each verification form will be numbered in top right corner, in order in which they were entered in electronic spreadsheet. Copies of these documents will be mailed to state ID&R coordinator no later than seven working days after the end of QQC period. Original folder will be filed and available for audit at regional office. MEA data specialist will prepare letters to notify any misidentified families by mail by the beginning of second week of month after QQC took place. To allow for an appeals process, if there is concern about the ineligibility determination, any party with a legitimate interest, including school district personnel, state staff or families themselves may ask for a "requested re-interview" to determine whether the information from the re-interview is correct. MEA data specialist will notify appropriate school districts in writing of the misidentified families with request to remove migrant coding and cease services immediately. State data collections coordinator will remove misidentified children from COEstar database. Regional offices will receive the corrected database through weekly transfer of information.

Note: Requested re-interviews are not part of quarterly quality control. All requested re-interviews for eligibility verifications will be counted separate from quarterly random sample, and results will be entered on spreadsheet named "Requested Re-interviews."

### Checking Defect Rates and Identifying and Correcting ID&R Problems.

After each quarterly re-interview round, state ID&R coordinator will review the verification data collected to determine:

- 1.Reasons for ineligibility
- 2.Reasons for discrepancies between the original COE and the verification re-interview data.
- 3.Sources of incomplete/inaccurate data on original COE

State ID&R coordinator will summarize issues identified, and append summary, along with any corrective actions taken, to QQC report.

For this reporting period, 150 re-interviews were sampled. 100 were successfully completed and 99 were found eligible (99%).

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 state has written procedures for inputting and updating child count data. At the beginning of each school year, and through a process managed at the MEA level by the coordinator, each child enrolled in the previous school year is re-signed. This means each family/self-eligible youth is contacted, existing data are verified, and updated information is secured. A new COE is not created unless there has been a new qualifying move. The previous COE is recertified with any updated information or necessary corrections.

LEAs are provided several reports during the year that are used to ensure their student information system is updated to reflect correct MEP eligibility. These reports, provided through our GaDOE secure portal and accessed by approved LEA staff, include the Current Enrollment Report that lists the current MEP participants with enrollment information for a single year - provided to LEAs at the beginning of each semester; New Participant Report lists participants who have been entered in to our database the previous month; New Student Report lists the PK-12 eligible migrant students who have been entered in to our database. LEAs are required to use these reports to update their own SIS. During yearly Title Cross Functional Monitoring, these SIS reports are reviewed for accuracy. If LEAs get errors in their reporting of migrant

students as compared to Georgia's unique testing identifier (GTID), they contact the MEP State Data Collections office to determine if the MEP code should be removed.

In addition to the on-going prospective re-interview process, at any time during the year and based upon the COE stored in COEstar, a determination of eligibility and accuracy of child eligibility data entry is relatively simple. The qualifying arrival date (QAD) listed on the COE is tested for the eligibility range. The residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is run. The age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he or she can be counted for funding/services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). Examples of additional checks include a comparison of like or nearly like names by looking at other demographic data (e.g., birth date, grade, gender, mother's maiden name, etc.). During the Quality Control Re-interview documentation review process, the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator reviews each COE to ensure all required elements and comments are present and that the eligibility determination is correct.

All COEs are approved by the State. The three GaDOE regional office coordinators review and approve each COE for their region. In addition to a formal Prospective Re-interview process to audit random COE samples, the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator, the State Data Collections Coordinator, and the State Director review random samples of COEs during the state's annual monitoring of its regional offices. Any issues that are identified are addressed with the regional coordinator and the regional or LEA recruiter.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEstar is a separate, but at the same time integrated component of Georgia's state wide student information collection system, with appropriate checks and balances performed in an on-going manner, annually. Each spring, the LEAs must match their migrant coding in the local student record system to the COEstar system before they are able to sign off on their data submission for the year. This helps to eliminate or correct coding and reporting errors in both systems. In addition, the COEstar Performance Reporter is run monthly to be sent to the state MEP director and regional MEA coordinators for review. This report is intended to catch obvious errors continuously throughout the program year rather than waiting until the end of the year.

As a final check for accuracy, the state MEP director is provided the data gleaned by the Performance Reporter in an Excel workbook covering the entire program year. The state MEP director reviews the data provided looking for anomalies and areas of confusion and/or contradictory data. When errors or problems are noted, immediate consultation with the state data collections coordinator, TROMIK (COEstar provider), and the regional MEA data specialists is initiated by the state director for explanation, review, and correction until the information is considered to be as accurate as possible.

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.

At the conclusion of each quarter's prospective re-interview work, a plan is established by the state to address, through corrective actions and improvements, any issues that led to any incorrect eligibility determinations uncovered during the reinterviews. Such plans are documented in the state's Re-Interview Quality Control Summary Report.

During the reporting period, 9/1/11 to 8/31/12, the state identified 1 (1.00%) children out of 100 whose re-interview information led to the conclusion that she was ineligible for program services and she was removed following the state's established protocol. The reasons for removing the eligibility status of this 1 child was that the worker did not have the intention to seek or obtain qualifying work or any kind of work. Recruiter was contacted and training was delivered.

The following is a summary of the corrective actions taken as a result of the re-interview process during the reporting period:

The recruiter at fault was contacted individually by the state ID&R coordinator shortly after the information was confirmed and specific re-training was delivered on the problematic areas identified. Additionally, training covering the problematic points discovered during the re-interviews was integrated into the mandatory ID&R training that all staff responsible for recruiting receives during the year.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child counts being reported are accurate and are based on an eligibility determination process that is well structured and sound. The process is believed to be well structured and sound because it is fulfilling its purpose, which is to clearly bring to the state's attention, in a time frame that allows for their immediate and early corrective action, the specific deficiencies that exist in accurately recording and reporting child eligibility information.