

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/>).

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13

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

Louisiana adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in mathematics and reading/language arts in grades 3-8 and high school. New transitional standards have been developed for implementation in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 with full implementation of the CCSS to follow in 2014-2015. Louisiana's transitional standards reflect the state's current standards that also align with the CCSS. Current Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) that are not included in the CCSS have been deleted from the transitional state standards. No revisions or changes are planned for Louisiana's science standards at this time. Louisiana is waiting for the release and review new common assessments in science currently under development.

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

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

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15
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

Louisiana's academic achievement standards for Reading/English language arts and mathematics will change in 2014-15 as the State implements the PARCC assessments. Louisiana science academic achievement standards will change in 2014-15 as the State will administer new assessments based on the Next Generation Science Standards. New standards will be set at that time.

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.

State has revised or changed	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	2012-13	2012-13	2014-15
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-13	2012-13	2014-15
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

Louisiana is administering new transitional assessments in mathematics and reading/English language arts in grades 3-8 and high school that reflect the transitional standards, i.e., current Grade Level Expectations that remain in the curriculum and align with the CCSS. These assessments will be implemented in 2012-2014, to be followed by the implementation of the PARCC assessments in 2014-15. Revisions or changes will be made to the science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school in 2014-15 based on the Next Generation Science Standards to be released in summer 2013.

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)	80.00
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	20.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	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)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	375,948	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,929	>=99
Asian	S	5,700	>=99
Black or African American	S	167,978	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	14,309	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	220	>=98
White	S	181,087	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,684	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	40,671	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,560	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	253,602	>=99
Migratory students	S	773	>=99
Male	S	192,509	>=99
Female	S	183,391	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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	6,063	14.91
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,664	53.27
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	9,780	24.05
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,164	7.78
Total	40,671	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	364,489	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,881	>=99
Asian	S	5,261	>=99
Black or African American	S	165,222	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	13,843	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	216	>=98
White	S	173,453	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,573	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	40,465	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,503	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	248,818	>=99
Migratory students	S	737	>=99
Male	S	186,498	>=99
Female	S	177,944	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The differences in the numbers of students taking the ELA assessments and the number for whom a proficiency level was assigned can be explained by the inclusion of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students who have been in the U.S. for less than a year in assessments. Though these students are tested, they are not assigned a proficiency level.			

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	322
--	-----

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	5,981	14.78
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,429	52.95
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	9,863	24.37
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,192	7.89
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	2	0.00
Total	40,467	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The differences in the numbers of students taking the ELA assessments and the number for whom a proficiency level was assigned can be explained by the inclusion of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students who have been in the U.S. for less than a year in assessments. Though these students are tested, they are not assigned a proficiency level.

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	357,682	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,826	>=99
Asian	S	5,216	>=99
Black or African American	S	161,364	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	13,629	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	216	>=98
White	S	170,869	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,522	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	33,461	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,415	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	243,266	>=99
Migratory students	S	733	>=99
Male	S	182,012	>=99
Female	S	175,627	>=99

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

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,200	18.53
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,519	64.31
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	4,310	12.88
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,432	4.28
Total	33,461	////////////////////////////////////

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

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	53,480	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	418	S	77
Asian	762	S	89
Black or African American	24,029	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	2,320	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	43	S	79
White	25,185	S	83
Two or more races	709	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,191	S	46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,479	S	66
Economically disadvantaged students	38,488	S	65
Migratory students	121	S	61
Male	27,768	S	71
Female	25,701	S	72
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.</p> <p>In the 3rd grade, there was a 21% drop in the number of eligible migrant children in 2011-12 as compared to the same grade in 2010-11.</p> <p>The two or more race data will be reviewed and updated as necessary during the data verification period.</p>			

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	53,422	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	417	S	69
Asian	745	S	85
Black or African American	24,029	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	2,291	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	43	S	77
White	25,174	S	80
Two or more races	709	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,192	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,420	S	59
Economically disadvantaged students	38,437	S	62
Migratory students	120	S	57
Male	27,740	S	64
Female	25,671	S	74
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.</p> <p>In the 3rd grade, there was a 21% drop in the number of eligible migrant children in 2011-12 as compared to the same grade in 2010-11.</p> <p>The two or more race data will be reviewed and updated as necessary during the data verification period.</p>			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52,965	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	415	S	68
Asian	758	S	81
Black or African American	23,774	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	2,298	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	43	S	67
White	24,957	S	82
Two or more races	706	S	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,734	S	43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,466	S	58
Economically disadvantaged students	38,098	S	61
Migratory students	120	S	60
Male	27,439	S	67
Female	25,515	S	68

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.

In the 3rd grade, there was a 21% drop in the number of eligible migrant children in 2011-12 as compared to the same grade in 2010-11.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,304	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	456	S	73
Asian	752	S	90
Black or African American	28,227	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	2,245	S	75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	29	S	>=90
White	25,924	S	85
Two or more races	669	S	81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,596	S	53
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,264	S	66
Economically disadvantaged students	42,728	S	67
Migratory students	125	S	72
Male	30,349	S	72
Female	27,952	S	73

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.
In the 4th grade, there was a 23% drop in the number of eligible migrant children in 2011-12 as compared to the same grade in 2010-11.

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	58,208	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	456	S	77
Asian	739	S	88
Black or African American	28,198	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	2,206	S	77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	28	S	89
White	25,911	S	85
Two or more races	668	S	83
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,593	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,203	S	64
Economically disadvantaged students	42,656	S	69
Migratory students	124	S	69
Male	30,300	S	71
Female	27,905	S	78

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.
In the 4th grade, there was a 23% drop in the number of eligible migrant children in 2011-12 as compared to the same grade in 2010-11.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,354	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	456	S	72
Asian	752	S	82
Black or African American	28,266	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	2,247	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	S	71
White	25,931	S	83
Two or more races	669	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,580	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,266	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	42,775	S	60
Migratory students	125	S	63
Male	30,385	S	67
Female	27,966	S	67

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.

In the 4th grade, there was a 23% drop in the number of eligible migrant children in 2011-12 as compared to the same grade in 2010-11.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,158	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	S	70
Asian	726	S	85
Black or African American	22,569	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	2,058	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	S	74
White	24,789	S	81
Two or more races	562	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,792	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	985	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	35,505	S	62
Migratory students	108	S	76
Male	26,242	S	70
Female	24,905	S	69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.			

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	51,119	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	S	67
Asian	716	S	83
Black or African American	22,568	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	2,036	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	59
White	24,784	S	78
Two or more races	562	S	79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,797	S	46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	945	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	35,475	S	63
Migratory students	108	S	69
Male	26,224	S	64
Female	24,884	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,920	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	390	S	65
Asian	716	S	78
Black or African American	21,197	S	46
Hispanic or Latino	1,992	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	S	66
White	24,030	S	80
Two or more races	551	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,590	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	951	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	33,616	S	56
Migratory students	103	S	68
Male	24,723	S	66
Female	24,186	S	63

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.

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	54,611	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	419	S	73
Asian	727	S	87
Black or African American	25,266	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	2,044	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	S	76
White	25,607	S	81
Two or more races	503	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,134	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	838	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	38,122	S	62
Migratory students	111	S	72
Male	28,127	S	68
Female	26,474	S	70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined. Data for migratory students will be reviewed and updated as necessary during the data verification period.			

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	54,562	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	419	S	68
Asian	719	S	84
Black or African American	25,270	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	2,007	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	S	63
White	25,600	S	79
Two or more races	502	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,140	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	782	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	38,083	S	61
Migratory students	110	S	62
Male	28,108	S	63
Female	26,445	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined. Data for migratory students will be reviewed and updated as necessary during the data verification period.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52,287	S	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	402	S	73
Asian	719	S	80
Black or African American	23,856	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	1,982	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	68
White	24,799	S	80
Two or more races	485	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,867	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	798	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	36,124	S	57
Migratory students	109	S	61
Male	26,568	S	66
Female	25,712	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.

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	50,736	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	399	S	71
Asian	733	S	87
Black or African American	22,345	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	1,957	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	26	S	77
White	24,820	S	80
Two or more races	451	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,293	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	761	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	34,029	S	61
Migratory students	120	S	63
Male	26,113	S	68
Female	24,616	S	69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.			

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	50,688	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	399	S	68
Asian	728	S	82
Black or African American	22,345	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	1,928	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	24	S	79
White	24,808	S	79
Two or more races	451	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,289	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	716	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	33,988	S	60
Migratory students	119	S	59
Male	26,084	S	62
Female	24,598	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,547	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	382	S	67
Asian	728	S	79
Black or African American	20,955	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	1,923	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	25	S	72
White	24,091	S	78
Two or more races	438	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,184	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	742	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	32,180	S	56
Migratory students	117	S	57
Male	24,602	S	63
Female	23,939	S	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,841	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	420	S	69
Asian	696	S	86
Black or African American	23,844	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	1,695	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	23	S	52
White	24,797	S	76
Two or more races	360	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,032	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	629	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	34,536	S	54
Migratory students	88	S	55
Male	26,361	S	64
Female	25,474	S	61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined. Data for migratory students will be reviewed and updated as necessary during the data verification period.			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,762	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	418	S	72
Asian	686	S	83
Black or African American	23,831	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	1,653	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	21	S	62
White	24,787	S	79
Two or more races	360	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,037	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	564	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	34,474	S	59
Migratory students	87	S	60
Male	26,318	S	63
Female	25,437	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined. Data for migratory students will be reviewed and updated as necessary during the data verification period.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,885	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	420	S	70
Asian	694	S	78
Black or African American	23,881	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	1,703	S	61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	23	S	52
White	24,797	S	77
Two or more races	361	S	70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,027	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	634	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	34,578	S	50
Migratory students	88	S	63
Male	26,395	S	61
Female	25,485	S	59
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total student count includes male, female, and a category called "invalid" for the gender category. Invalid includes students who have a hand-coded test document, and for whom a valid gender is not determined.</p> <p>Data for migratory students will be reviewed and updated as necessary during the data verification period.</p>			

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	55,818	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	407	S	83
Asian	1,304	S	95
Black or African American	21,698	S	73
Hispanic or Latino	1,990	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	23	S	74
White	29,965	S	90
Two or more races	430	S	89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,633	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	604	S	54
Economically disadvantaged students	30,194	S	76
Migratory students	100	S	74
Male	27,549	S	82
Female	28,269	S	85

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The change in the assessment to an end of course test during the 2011-12 school year reduced the number of students who tested.

The number of students who tested in math is significantly higher than the number of students who tested in ELA and science because two subjects (Algebra I and Geometry) are tested in high school for math, and only one each for ELA (English II) and science (Biology I).

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	44,406	S	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	361	S	91
Asian	870	S	91
Black or African American	18,965	S	83
Hispanic or Latino	1,527	S	87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	19	S	>=80
White	22,345	S	95
Two or more races	319	S	93
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,415	S	58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	551	S	66
Economically disadvantaged students	25,453	S	86
Migratory students	65	S	80
Male	21,551	S	87
Female	22,855	S	92

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The change in the assessment to an end of course test during the 2011-12 school year reduced the number of students who tested.

The number of students who tested in math is significantly higher than the number of students who tested in ELA and science because two subjects (Algebra I and Geometry) are tested in high school for math, and only one each for ELA (English II) and science (Biology I).

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	44,724	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	361	S	89
Asian	849	S	93
Black or African American	19,435	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	1,484	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	19	S	>=80
White	22,264	S	94
Two or more races	312	S	90
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,479	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	558	S	63
Economically disadvantaged students	25,895	S	80
Migratory students	71	S	79
Male	21,900	S	85
Female	22,824	S	87

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The change in the assessment to an end of course test during the 2011-12 school year reduced the number of students who tested.

The number of students who tested in math is significantly higher than the number of students who tested in ELA and science because two subjects (Algebra I and Geometry) are tested in high school for math, and only one each for ELA (English II) and science (Biology I).

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,437	920	64.02
Districts	132	6	4.55

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in the number of schools is attributed to the increase in the number of charter schools that opened during the 2011-12 school year. Many of these charters are also considered an LEA, thus increasing the number of LEAs in the state.

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	915	638	69.73
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	898	626	69.71
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	17	12	70.59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data will be uploaded to EDEN prior to the data verification period.

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
106	5	4.72

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of districts (LEAs) that received Title I funds increased due to the number of new charter schools, which are considered LEAs, in the state.

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	15
Extension of the school year or school day	11
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	8
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	9
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	4
Reopening the school as a public charter school	3
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	1
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This is not applicable, as there are no districts that were identified for improvement.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no districts in corrective action in the 2011-12 school year.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The school level data will be provided during the data verification period.		

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Salaries and travel were paid for employees who work with Districts with chronically low-performing schools and SIG 1003g competitive award recipients. District and school visits were conducted. Technical assistance and training session were conducted statewide. Consultants were contracted to assist with the development of a state School Turnaround Office and staff job descriptions

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	19,502
Applied to transfer	1,062
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	723
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 10,467

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	1

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	30,653
Applied for supplemental educational services	16,910
Received supplemental educational services	11,160
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,260,751
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	178,623	157,675	88.27	20,948	11.73
All elementary classes	124,451	111,459	89.56	12,992	10.44
All secondary classes	54,172	46,216	85.31	7,956	14.69

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
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	32.30
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	16.50
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	51.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	40.80
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	13.30
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	45.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	25,911	20,962	80.90
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	37,738	35,581	94.28
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	7,998	6,287	78.61
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	20,049	18,390	91.73

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	91.50	59.70
Poverty metric used	The poverty metric used was students who qualify for free or reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	80.90	47.10
Poverty metric used	The poverty metric used was students who qualify for free or reduced lunch.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish, Vietnamese, French Creole
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Several LEAs use push-in where students are served in the mainstream classroom with ESL teacher or paraprofessional providing clarification and translation as needed.

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	13,952
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	13,125
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	9,959
Vietnamese	1,365
Arabic	889
Chinese	432
French	255

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	13,316
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	68
Total	13,384
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,410
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10.32
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	12,564
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	35
Total	12,599
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	4,424

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress				
Attained proficiency				
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,683	3,500	6,183
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data will be provided prior to the data verification period.		

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
2,118	S	83	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data will be provided prior to the data verification period.			

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
1,860	S	85	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,845	S	80	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	38
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	27
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	36
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	33
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	34
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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)	6
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	6
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Separate consortia members were counted in the total number of subgrantees and in AMAOs 1, 2, and 3 determinations. Each LEA member of a Title III consortium was included in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
3,173	1,352	7

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	287
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	449

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	33	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	29	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	25	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	19	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	19	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	7	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	33	6,042
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	25	1,350
PD provided to principals	30	1,064
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	25	720
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	20	619
PD provided to community based organization personnel	9	217
Total	142	10,012

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Several LEAs offered community-based/family-oriented professional development, job-embedded subject matter professional development at school sites, and professional development on using technology in ESL programs.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/01/11	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the 2011-2012 funding cycle, the state implemented procedures to allow all recipients that submit application in the electronic grants management system to draw down funds once a substantially approved application was submitted or July 1, whichever was later. This process allowed the LEAs to be able to draw funds during the process of the SEA making final approval of their application. This ensured the LEA's ability to maintain their Title III program without a period of inactivity due to funding constraints.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	139	139
LEAs with subgrants	15	15
Total	154	154
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	452	525
K	1,060	1,035
1	1,014	1,027
2	905	896
3	835	944
4	939	1,007
5	714	844
6	739	942
7	614	688
8	658	738
9	584	892
10	443	688
11	312	447
12	356	464
Ungraded		
Total	9,625	11,137
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are no homeless children/youths who are in grade "ungraded".		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	712	697
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	8,138	9,417
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	572	629
Hotels/Motels	203	394
Total	9,625	11,137
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	760
K	1,366
1	1,392
2	1,192
3	1,195
4	1,272
5	1,080
6	1,103
7	875
8	932
9	993
10	803
11	505
12	549
Ungraded	
Total	14,017
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are no students in the ungraded category.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,855
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,922
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	251
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,535	842
4	1,767	1,097
5	1,340	734
6	1,436	763
7	1,073	569
8	1,171	595
High School	803	648

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

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,541	918
4	1,775	1,065
5	1,345	749
6	1,445	804
7	1,080	599
8	1,176	562
High School	902	622

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	1,525	822
4	1,782	936
5	1,265	616
6	1,359	670
7	1,017	497
8	1,183	525
High School	768	587

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)	319
K	186
1	235
2	220
3	189
4	200
5	212
6	193
7	189
8	164
9	163
10	133
11	97
12	99
Ungraded	15
Out-of-school	141
Total	2,755
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2010-2011 count was 3047 and the 2011-2012 count is 2755. The decrease of 292 is not greater than 10%.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	16
1	15
2	17
3	20
4	14
5	13
6	13
7	5
8	7
9	3
10	2
11	0
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	137
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2010-2011 count was 76 and the 2011-2012 count is 137. Two parishes conducted supplemental migrant summer programs in coordination with the remediation programs offered by the school districts. This led to an increase of 61 migrant students participating in summer programs in 2011-2012.

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.

Louisiana collects its migrant data in Migrant Education Records in Louisiana (MERIL2), a MIS 2000 software system. This is a consolidated database from the 8 Local Operating Agencies (LOA) systems. This data is assimilated daily into the state database. The compiled Category 1 and 2 counts came from this state system. Category 1 and 2 child counts for 2010-2011 were generated using the same 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.

Both counts were collected in Migrant Education Records in Louisiana (MERIL2), a MIS 2000 software system. This is a consolidated database from the 8 Local Operating Agencies (LOA) systems. This data is assimilated daily into the state database. Louisiana's COE collects all data elements including demographic and MEP eligibility enrollment data as required by the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE) to be used for generating the child counts. Families and migratory youth are recruited via personal interviews conducted by MEP LOA recruiters or through MEP/LOA updates of existing COEs. COEs are entered electronically into the MIS2000 system in the field by trained recruiters via Tablet computers. The data is collected and examined throughout the year and, after data is run through all automatic and manual edit and error checks (including review by the LOAs), the final reports are run and submitted to the CSPR via EDEN NX 121 and 122 files.

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.

Child count data collection begins with the completion of the National COE. Families and migratory youth are recruited via personal interviews or through MEP/LOA updates of existing COEs. COEs follow a rigorous multi-step review process that includes both manual and electronic checks. COEs are entered electronically into the MIS2000 system in the field by trained recruiters via Tablet computers. There are several error-check features programmed into the software to ensure that all fields required by the National COE are completed. After the recruiters have input all of the data, "draft" COEs are uploaded to be electronically reviewed by LOA coordinators. LOA coordinators verify eligibility data and upload each reviewed draft COE to the LOA's Data Specialist. The Data Specialists review COEs, search the MERIL2 system for existing records to avoid duplication, and verify the school name and school enrollment data for all school-aged children on the COE. After completing their review, the Data Specialists upload the COEs to the state MEP Coordinator for final approval. Upon final approval, the draft COE is loaded into the state database as an "Approved" COE.

If a child on a COE is determined to be ineligible at any stage of the verification process or if there is an error on the COE, it is rejected and sent "down" to the next lower level for correction or removal (if child is not eligible). A log is automatically created that tracks each stage of the verification process, including any reasons for rejection.

At the beginning of each new school year, reports are generated from MERIL2 to provide MEP advocates with a list of children who were in each service area during the previous school year. Advocates use the report to verify each child's presence in school, his/her school enrollment date, and his/her grade level through school or home visits. This is referred to as "mass enrollment" and is done on or after September 1 each year. When the advocates have collected all the data, he/she signs, dates and returns the mass enrollment form to the Data Specialist, who enters any updated information and files the report for documentation of each student's residence. If a new qualifying move has occurred, the recruiter will enter a new COE via the Tablet computer.

Louisiana uses "mass enrollment", instead of securing new COEs (unless there has been a new qualifying move) or updating COEs on each family, because it accomplishes the requirement to verify and document the presence of each child with a minimized paperwork burden.

Enrollment and participation data for Category 2 is collected in MERIL2. Participating students have an enrollment date between 5/28/12 - 7/31/12, a participation type of "S" for summer, and have received a MEP funded service during that time frame as documented on the child's Supplemental Services Form. This form is completed by a MEP advocate and the Data Specialist inputs the data into MERIL2. All of the data for summer participation is inputted into MERIL by the end of the 2nd week of August.

Throughout the year, checks are taken by staff to ensure that no duplications exist with student records. On the LOA level, when the Data Specialist receives a new electronic COE from a recruiter, she conducts a search of the MERIL2 system. When similar names are found, the Data Specialist reviews birth dates, parents' names and other data to determine whether the name is new, or a duplicate. If the Data Specialist determines that the name matches an existing student, the new information is merged into the regional database. If there is no match for the name or names on the COE, the Data Specialist creates a new record for the child. MSIX's matching algorithm is also used to identify potential

duplicates. On a state level, there is a report feature in MERIL2 that generates list of potential duplicate students based upon a matching algorithm. The State MEP generates this report and merges duplicate students in December, May, and middle August of each year.

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.

Louisiana uses the same system to generate the Category 2 count

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.

In calculating the count of eligible students for the reporting period, only students who meet the MEP program eligibility guidelines are counted, using several mathematical checks that are utilized to ensure that children are within the eligible age range and had a documented residency during the period. MERIL2 calculates fields of LQM3 (last qualifying move date plus three years), twenty-second birth date (birth date plus twenty-two years), and third birth date (birth date plus three years).

The counting program selects only children who resided in the state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1/11-8/31/12), whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 9/1/11 whose third birth date is less than or equal to 8/31/12, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date. The residency determination is made by selecting only children whose funding date (school enrollment date or generated date of residency date for students not in school) is between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12, residency date is between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12, withdrawal date is between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12, or termination date is between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12.

The summer report selects children who received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term and whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 5/28/12, whose twenty-second birth date is greater than or equal to 5/28/12, whose third birth date is less than or equal to 7/31/12, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date or termination is null, whose third birth date is less than or equal to the withdrawal date or the withdrawal date is null, whose enrollment date was between 5/28/12 and 7/31/12, and whose enrollment type was S (summer) or a Supplemental program date between 5/28/12 - 7/31/12. If the enrollment was entered in error, it is removed.

MERIL2 assures that students are counted only once per child count category by assigning each child a student sequence number. If a child has multiple school history lines that fit the funding criteria, MERIL2 only counts the student sequence number once.

At the beginning of each new school year, reports are generated from MERIL2 to provide MEP advocates with a list of children who were in each service area during the previous school year. Advocates use the report to verify each child's presence in school, his/her school enrollment date, and his/her grade level through school or home visits. This is referred to as "mass enrollment" and is done on or after September 1 each year. When the advocates have collected all the data, he/she signs, dates and returns the mass enrollment form to the Data Specialist, who enters any updated information and files the report for documentation of each student's residence. If a new qualifying move has occurred, the recruiter will enter a new COE via the Tablet computer.

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.

Louisiana uses the same system to generate the Category 2 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.

Louisiana's Quality Control process begins with a well-trained recruiting staff. Recruiter training is conducted at least annually by the SEA and/or regional LOAs, and training covers topics such as eligibility requirements, eligibility definition, and temporary versus seasonal employment.

COEs follow a rigorous multi-step review process that includes both manual and electronic checks. Families and migratory youth are recruited via personal interviews or through MEP/LOA staff updates of existing COEs. National COEs are entered electronically into the MIS2000 system in the field by trained recruiters via Tablet computers. There are several error-check features programmed into the software to ensure that all fields required by the National COE are completed. After the recruiters have input all of the data, a "draft" of the COEs are uploaded to be electronically reviewed by LOA coordinators. LOA coordinators verify eligibility data and upload the reviewed draft COE to the LOA's Data Specialist. The Data

Specialists review the COE, search the MERIL2 system for existing records to avoid duplication, and verify the school name and school enrollment data for all school-aged children on the COE. After completing their review, the Data Specialist uploads the COE to the state MEP Coordinator for final approval. Upon final approval, the draft COE is loaded into the state database as an "Approved" COE. If a child on a COE is determined to be ineligible at any stage of the verification process

or if there is an error on the COE, it is rejected and sent "down" to the next lower level for correction or removal (if child is not eligible). A log is automatically created that tracks each stage of the verification process, including any reasons for rejection. With the electronic entry and review of COEs, the entire verification and approval process is generally 8 - 12 hours.

Questions of eligibility are resolved by following the MEP "chain of command." Recruiters refer eligibility questions to their coordinators and coordinators refer their questions to the state MEP. If the state MEP is unable to resolve the issue, it will refer the question to its OME program officer.

Recruitment verification is monitored throughout the entire year. Reports have been developed for use by each LOA to verify the accuracy of the data in MERIL2. In addition, the MEP state staff generates a report of the electronic tracking logs that are generated for each COE to review the performance of individual recruiters and to determine the need for technical assistance.

Throughout the year, checks are taken by staff to ensure that no duplications exist with student records. On the LOA level, when the Data Specialist receives a new electronic COE from a recruiter, she conducts a search of the MERIL2 system for existing records. When similar names are found, the Data Specialist reviews birth dates, parents' names and other data to determine whether the name is new, or a duplicate. If the Data Specialist determines that the name matches an existing student, the new information is merged into the regional database. If there is no match for the name or names on the COE, the Data Specialist creates a new record for the child. MSIX's matching algorithm is also used to identify potential duplicates. On a state level, there is a report feature in MERIL2 that generates list of potential duplicate students based upon a designed matching algorithm. The State MEP generates this report and merges duplicate students in December and middle August of each year.

The following cross-checks are programmed into the reports used to generate child counts to ensure no duplicates are included in child count numbers:

- 1) Students with matching social security numbers;
- 2) Students with matching date of birth, and last names (excluding students marked as multiple births);
- 3) Students with the same first name and date of birth -but totally different last names (possibly adopted or married);
- 4) Students with same last names, and similar date of birth.

All LOAs were instructed to verify that summer enrollments were based on programs and services provided during the actual period of summer vacation in the relevant school district. (School schedules vary from district to district.) The LOAs are also instructed to keep documentation of summer services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Louisiana MEP conducted its year-one prospective re-interview in the Spring 2012. Using a specially designed MIS2000 report, a list of COEs completed between 9/1/11 - 3/6/12 was randomly generated from MERIL2. Forty (40) re-interviews were conducted by 11 independent recruiters from five of Louisiana's eight (8) LOAs. No re-interviewer conducted interviews within his/her LOA. The results gathered by the re-interviewers were reviewed by a 3-person panel. None of the 40 was found to be ineligible.

As part of our on-going quality control, at the beginning of each school year, the residency of each child is verified through the mass-enrollment procedure. In addition, at least once per year, each of the 8 LOAs generates a list of migrant families to be re-interviewed by using a MERIL2/2000 report designed to produce a random sample for this purpose. A trained recruiter, other than the one who completed the original COE, performs the re-interview. The LOA re-interviewer and uses the ConQIR Consortium-developed re-interview questions. During the re-interview, all data regarding eligibility and student information is verified. All discrepancies are noted for review and correction. Errors that do not impact eligibility are corrected in the local MIS2000 system and uploaded into the state database. If a child's eligibility is in question, the LOA coordinator contacts the state MEP office for guidance on what actions need to be taken. Any ineligible child is removed from MERIL2.

Sampling for the 2011-2012 re-interview was statewide and contained COEs for each of our 8 LOAs. Due to severe travel restrictions both at the state and local level at the time the re-interviews were conducted, the re-interviews were conducted by phone. The random sample pool size was 100, but only 40 families were successfully contacted.

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 LDOE follow a rigorous multi-step review process that includes both manual and electronic checks. Children are recruited via personal interviews or through MEP/LOA staff updates of existing COEs. COEs are entered electronically into the MIS2000 system in the field by trained recruiters via Tablet computers. There are several error check features programmed into the software to ensure that all fields required by the National COE are completed. After the recruiters have input all of the data, a "draft" of the COEs are uploaded to be electronically reviewed by LOA coordinators. LOA coordinators verify eligibility data and upload the reviewed draft COE to the LOA's Data Specialist. The Data Specialists review the COE, search the MERIL 2 system for existing records to avoid duplication, and verify the school name and school enrollment data for all school-aged children on the COE. After completing their review, the Data Specialist uploads the COE to the state

MEP Coordinator for final approval. Upon final approval, the draft COE is loaded into the state database as an "Approved" COE. If a child on a COE is determined to be ineligible at any stage of the verification process or if there is an error on the COE, it is rejected and sent "down" to the next lower level for correction or removal (if child is not eligible). A log is automatically created that tracks each stage of the verification process, including any reasons for rejection. With the electronic entry and review of COEs, the entire verification and approval process is generally 8 - 12 hours.

In addition, recruitment verification is monitored throughout the entire year. Reports have been developed for use by each LOA to verify the accuracy of the data in MERIL2. Copies of relevant OME guidance is distributed to all local MEP staff members. This guidance was reviewed at several trainings for LOAs staff during 10-11. In addition, the MEP state staff generates a report of the electronic tracking logs that are generated for each COE to review the performance of individual recruiters and to determine the need for technical assistance. During 2011-2012, a member of the State MEP visited each of the 8 LOAs to observe ID&R practices and to provide any necessary technical assistance.

Also, throughout the enrollment process, trained Data Specialists ensure that students are not duplicated in the system at the LOA and state-wide level by performing a records search when a need COE is submitted. If two enrolled students are determined to be the same student, they are merged into one record in MERIL2.

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.

Before the submission of the Category 1 and Category 2 child count data for annual reporting, state staff creates a "Snapshot" of the MERIL2 database that "freezes" MERIL2, which helps ensure the integrity of the data used for reporting. MIS2000 reports have been specifically designed to compile the data for NX121 and NX122. Report results are organized by LOA. Each LOA receives a copy of their report for review and verification. After the counts are verified by the LOAs,

electronic versions of the list of students included in the counts are saved on the state server.

The Category 1 and Category 2 child counts are rechecked and compared to the last year's figures by two or more MEP State staff, including the MEP State director, to provide a final review of the data that will be submitted.

The child counts are reviewed by the State Director. Each year, after the child count reports are run, comparative charts are created. These charts show a minimum of three years child count and PFS data for each of our 8 LOAs. These charts are evaluated and used to identify trends, possible data problems, and for strategic planning.

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.

None of the families re-interviewed in 2011-2012 were found to be ineligible. But errors made on COEs and/or COEs that are not approved are tracked throughout the year and are used to provide targeted training.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has no concerns at this time about the accuracy of the 2011-2012 child counts or underlying eligibility determinations. All information has been reviewed and verified by regional coordinators and Data Specialists and by the MEP state coordinator. The numbers presented are accurate to the best of our ability and our quality control procedures and processes.