

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**

MASSACHUSETTS



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Massachusetts	
Address: 75 Pleasant St. Malden, MA 02148	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Robert Curtin	
Telephone: 781-338-3582	
Fax: 781-338-6850	
e-mail: rcurtin@doe.mass.edu	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mitchell D. Chester	
_____	Thursday, December 20, 2012, 1:52:28 PM
Signature	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

<p>No Revisions or changes</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has 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.</p>

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards			

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

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

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

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

No Revisions or changes	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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.

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			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
No Revisions or changes	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			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	40.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	60.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	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	497,984	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,185	>=99
Asian	S	27,859	98
Black or African American	S	41,370	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	74,973	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	542	97
White	S	339,114	>=99
Two or more races	S	12,783	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	91,876	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	31,352	90
Economically disadvantaged students	S	180,433	98
Migratory students	S	41	76
Male	S	255,002	>=99
Female	S	242,929	>=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	10,465	11.39
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72,500	78.91
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	67	0.07
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,844	9.63
Total	91,876	////////////////////////////////////
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	497,549	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,184	>=99
Asian	S	27,788	>=99
Black or African American	S	41,346	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	74,705	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	539	>=99
White	S	339,049	>=99
Two or more races	S	12,765	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	91,757	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	31,048	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	180,261	>=99
Migratory students	S	39	>=90
Male	S	254,654	>=99
Female	S	242,830	>=99

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

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

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

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	2,935
--	-------

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	10,310	11.22
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72,712	79.10
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	56	0.06
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,679	9.44
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	167	0.18
Total	91,924	////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.		

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	215,108	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	503	97
Asian	S	11,616	97
Black or African American	S	18,342	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	30,947	96
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	240	>=98
White	S	148,268	>=99
Two or more races	S	5,132	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	39,340	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	11,018	87
Economically disadvantaged students	S	76,213	97
Migratory students	S	14	70
Male	S	110,234	>=99
Female	S	104,857	>=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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,037	28.06
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,161	63.96
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	18	0.05
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,124	7.94
Total	39,340	////////////////////////////////////
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	70,763	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	S	50
Asian	4,373	S	78
Black or African American	5,611	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	11,561	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	74	S	51
White	46,691	S	68
Two or more races	2,243	S	62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,810	S	26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,514	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	26,473	S	41
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,300	S	60
Female	34,454	S	61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	70,709	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	S	52
Asian	4,367	S	69
Black or African American	5,596	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	11,533	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	74	S	49
White	46,686	S	70
Two or more races	2,241	S	64
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,826	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,480	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	26,462	S	40
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,257	S	57
Female	34,444	S	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,425	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	163	S	41
Asian	4,194	S	71
Black or African American	5,715	S	24
Hispanic or Latino	11,202	S	29
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	71	S	39
White	47,016	S	58
Two or more races	2,043	S	50
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,321	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,919	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	26,159	S	31
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,030	S	50
Female	34,387	S	53
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	70,264	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	S	43
Asian	4,180	S	68
Black or African American	5,704	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	11,148	S	32
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	50
White	46,942	S	65
Two or more races	2,037	S	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,277	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,873	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	26,074	S	35
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	35,925	S	50
Female	34,330	S	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,484	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	S	48
Asian	4,103	S	76
Black or African American	5,900	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	10,934	S	32
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	58
White	48,182	S	64
Two or more races	2,088	S	55
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,785	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,954	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	26,582	S	36
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,668	S	56
Female	34,810	S	58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	71,423	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	S	50
Asian	4,097	S	70
Black or African American	5,896	S	39
Hispanic or Latino	10,907	S	35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	88	S	64
White	48,160	S	68
Two or more races	2,082	S	62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,781	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,927	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	26,571	S	40
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,624	S	56
Female	34,788	S	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	71,373	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	S	38
Asian	4,100	S	61
Black or African American	5,881	S	22
Hispanic or Latino	10,914	S	23
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	49
White	48,116	S	61
Two or more races	2,086	S	52
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,742	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,946	S	10
Economically disadvantaged students	26,531	S	28
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,607	S	51
Female	34,760	S	52
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	71,640	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	S	47
Asian	4,003	S	80
Black or African American	5,893	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	10,968	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	94	S	68
White	48,706	S	67
Two or more races	1,801	S	57
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,674	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,346	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	26,470	S	39
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,845	S	59
Female	34,786	S	62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	71,589	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	153	S	55
Asian	4,003	S	77
Black or African American	5,882	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	10,951	S	40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	94	S	70
White	48,681	S	75
Two or more races	1,801	S	66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,661	S	26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,306	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	26,456	S	44
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,811	S	62
Female	34,766	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,952	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	S	38
Asian	3,681	S	73
Black or African American	6,151	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	10,809	S	26
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	66	S	44
White	49,397	S	59
Two or more races	1,633	S	48
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,372	S	13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,527	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	26,325	S	30
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,859	S	50
Female	35,085	S	53
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	71,749	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	S	61
Asian	3,668	S	80
Black or African American	6,142	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	10,703	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	66	S	58
White	49,325	S	78
Two or more races	1,631	S	70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,298	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,457	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	26,182	S	52
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,695	S	65
Female	35,046	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72,705	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	S	35
Asian	3,742	S	74
Black or African American	6,159	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	10,497	S	26
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	53
White	50,468	S	60
Two or more races	1,579	S	48
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,268	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,175	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	25,726	S	30
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	37,269	S	52
Female	35,428	S	53
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	72,756	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	S	71
Asian	3,734	S	88
Black or African American	6,182	S	65
Hispanic or Latino	10,471	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	S	86
White	50,523	S	86
Two or more races	1,581	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,310	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,137	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	25,773	S	64
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	37,310	S	76
Female	35,434	S	85
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	72,535	S	42
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	S	25
Asian	3,732	S	58
Black or African American	6,137	S	17
Hispanic or Latino	10,424	S	16
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	46
White	50,410	S	50
Two or more races	1,574	S	41
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,183	S	12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,155	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,597	S	20
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	37,168	S	44
Female	35,360	S	40
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	69,015	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	S	65
Asian	3,763	S	90
Black or African American	5,941	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	9,002	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	61
White	48,654	S	84
Two or more races	1,396	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,646	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,917	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	22,698	S	62
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	35,031	S	77
Female	33,979	S	80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	69,059	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	163	S	80
Asian	3,739	S	90
Black or African American	5,944	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	8,992	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	80
White	48,732	S	93
Two or more races	1,392	S	89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,604	S	60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,868	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	22,743	S	77
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	35,032	S	86
Female	34,022	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	71,200	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	S	56
Asian	3,784	S	79
Black or African American	6,324	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	9,609	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	92	S	57
White	49,742	S	76
Two or more races	1,472	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,415	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,917	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	24,085	S	46
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,459	S	67
Female	34,737	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	1,834		
Districts	401		

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As a result of receiving flexibility under certain provisions of No Child Left Behind, the ESE did not make AYP determinations for the 2011-12 school year.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,011		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	518		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	492		

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As a result of receiving flexibility under certain provisions of No Child Left Behind, the ESE did not make AYP determinations for the 2011-12 school year.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
400		

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As a result of receiving flexibility under certain provisions of No Child Left Behind, the ESE did not make AYP determinations for the 2011-12 school year.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	53
Extension of the school year or school day	69
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	30
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	12
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	71
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	45
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)	36
Reopening the school as a public charter school	6
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	8
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	337
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.

To address achievement problems in Massachusetts' districts, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) utilizes two workgroups: the Office of District and School Turnaround (ODST) provides support to the 13 Level 4 ("underperforming") districts which are identified for improvement or corrective action and have the most persistent student performance challenges; and the District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) serve Level 3 districts that have Title I schools and are at-risk of becoming Level 4. Both ODST and the DSACs comprise the state's System of Support and address the needs of districts that fall at Levels 3 (DSACs) and 4 (ODST) in the state's new accountability framework

Targeted Assistance to High-Needs (Level 4) Districts

In January 2010, Governor Patrick signed An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap providing new authorities to superintendents and the commissioner to intervene in the Commonwealth's lowest performing districts and schools. With the new law, the new funding and requirements of the federal School Improvement Grants (1003g), and the Race to the Top Turnaround initiatives, ESE created the Office of District and School Turnaround (ODST) to ensure that a comprehensive approach was taken to leverage the new resources and requirements through coherent and effective management. The theory of action in the Office of District and School Turnaround is as follows: if ESE can support districts to use a continuous cycle of improvement to turn around their lowest performing schools, then districts will strengthen the district systems of support necessary to continuously improve district and school performance.

Districts enter Level 4 (and receive assistance from ODST) for one of two reasons: either because they have one or more Level 4 schools, the Commonwealth's lowest performing and least improving 43 schools (Boston, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, New Bedford, Salem, Springfield, and Worcester); or because a district review has concluded that district-level challenges are so significant that it warrants state intervention (Gill Montague, Holyoke, New Bedford, Randolph, and Southbridge).

Districts with Level 4 schools are given priority for the federal School Improvement Grant (1003g), ongoing assistance from a District Liaison (a Manager assigned a subset of these 10 districts who develop strong professional relationships and build capacity at the district level to support schools), and priority access to Race to the Top turnaround initiatives (Priority Partners for Turnaround, Turnaround Teacher and Leader Teams, and Wraparound Zones).

Level 4 schools can be turned around through targeted district intervention that addresses the core issues causing the lagging or declining student performance. Through such targeted interventions, students at every school in the district will benefit and have access to high-quality learning opportunities both in and out of the classroom that prepare them for success after high school. There have already been some early successes in this work:

- 27 of our 35 Level 4 schools are above turnaround targets in at least 1 subject area.
- Overall growth in our level 4 schools rose 3 points in ELA, and 6 points in mathematics in 2011; these improvements were consistent even among the lowest performing subgroups, such students with disabilities and ELLs.

For each district placed in Level 4 based on district-level challenges, ODST recruits, trains, and supports a half-time Level 4 District Plan Manager who reports to the superintendent of the district and is responsible for providing lead project management support for the execution of a data-driven and results-oriented Level 4 District Plan. The Plan Managers add additional capacity to these districts and help prepare monthly reports on progress to the Center for District and School Accountability.

Each of the above assistance strategies reinforces the Office's theory of action to build district capacity. All of the grants require an analysis of the data to drive priorities and strategies, a plan for monitoring implementation through tracking benchmarks and leading indicators, and evidence that the data collection and monitoring is resulting in mid-course corrections. The Liaisons and Plan Managers assist in building district capacity to analyze data in meaningful ways, set rigorous but realistic benchmarks of progress, and develop systems for monitoring progress and implementation. Liaisons also assist districts in applying lessons learned from Level 4 school intervention to their most struggling Level 3 schools

Regionally-Based Targeted Assistance

In fall 2009, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education established six regional District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) to assist districts and their schools in strategically accessing and using professional

development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for all students. The DSACs give first priority for assistance to Level 3 and 4 (non-Commissioner's) districts, as outlined in the ESE Framework for District Accountability and Assistance. In 2011-2012, DSACs served 47 Level 3 and 4 districts as well as another 14 Level 2 districts with less intensive services.

Each DSAC is led by a Regional Assistance Director, a recently retired superintendent, who works with a small assistance team of a former principal, a data specialist, a mathematics specialist, and a literacy specialist. The DSAC teams collaborate with districts to assess their strengths and needs and then facilitate access to effective strategies, resources, and professional development, establish partnerships and networks, and deliver individualized assistance for the region's districts. The DSAC teams work with districts and their schools to strengthen and improve schools in accordance with district and school improvement plans.

Examples of DSAC assistance include:

1. Access to high quality professional development in literacy, mathematics, instructional leadership, sheltered content for English language learners, and inclusive practices for students with disabilities;
2. Assistance with self-assessments to target areas of greatest need and support for improvement planning at the school and district level;
3. Training on and modeling the use of tools for Learning Walkthroughs, building effective use of common planning time, and using data for district-level strategic decisions;
4. Networks for superintendents, principals, mathematics and literacy leaders, coaches, and/or teachers to share and learn about effective practices in instruction, data use and leadership; and
5. Data reporting, analysis, and data use training to support district self-assessment and evaluation.

Title I eligible Level 3 and 4 districts received FY12 Title I School Improvement Grant funds to use to support the participation of teachers and leaders from Title I schools in NCLB status in professional development and DSAC-provided and other targeted assistance efforts aligned with their School Improvement Plans.

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	44
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	5
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	5
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	11	5
Schools	27	13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	11/02/12
---	----------

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 1.30%

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- C SPR 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.

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.

Several indicators were used to assess the progress of SIG funded schools as well as the state's implementation of SIG funds in SY 2011-2012. Each indicator is followed up with customized assistance to both districts and schools from the Office of District and School Turnaround (ODST) based on the data received. Assistance is provided in the form of one-on-one technical assistance from ODST staff members to school and district leaders, facilitated group assistance sessions, written feedback and support, and webinars/conference calls.

Monitoring Site Visits (MSVs) - MSVs are conducted annually to analyze the implementation of SIG goals and benchmarks as outlined in the original Redesign Plan (SIG grant application). The MSVs also align to the Level 4 Schools monitoring requirements under An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap. If areas of weakness are evidenced in a MSV, the ESE provided assistance to the school and district towards improvement. ESE looks across MSV reports after each cycle to identify common areas where performance is lagging in Level 4 schools and develops or coordinates supports to address those areas. In 2011-2012, all SIG funded schools received a MSV and accompanying progress report.

SIG Renewal Application Process - The SIG Renewal Application provides schools and districts with tools to reflect upon the previous year's turnaround efforts, make mid-course corrections, and improve benchmarks, while providing ESE the opportunity to formally review the progress of SIG-funded schools in reference to stated goals and implementation benchmarks to determine funding for Year Two/Three. School and district leaders from the first cohort of 12 SIG schools and the second cohort of 18 SIG schools participated in a webinar or in a face-to-face technical assistance session that provided direct support towards their completion of the Year 2 and Year 3 Renewal application. All schools received Year 2 and 3 funding, as well as detailed feedback from the review teams with suggestions of ways to improve practice with year 2 and year 3 funding.

Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs) Collection and Reporting - A cross-unit ESE team has collected, analyzed and is reporting back to schools and districts data on progress towards performance targets as well as targets for student rates and college/career readiness and school culture. The MAGs for each school were generated with assistance from the ESE and were approved as part of the original Redesign Plan. If a school does not meet MAGs, ESE provides the school with assistance in identifying reasons for the underperformance.

SIG Evaluation: The ODST Office has partnered with the Office of Strategic Planning, Research and Evaluation to develop and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, impact and outcomes of LEA school intervention activities, efforts and models of SRG funded schools/districts. The evaluation will also address the return on investments made by districts and schools with this funding source to inform future similar ESE grants.

Preliminary Analysis of Trends in Low-Performing Schools: Staff in ODST review trends in student performance data, MSV reports, and Renewal Applications to monitor SIG schools that are on-track, in warning or are at high-risk. The ODST staff uses this information to target support to districts and schools.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Actions taken by Massachusetts in 2011-12 to support Title I districts and schools include: funding some DSAC targeted assistance staff with state targeted assistance, RTTT, and IDEA resources. In addition, targeted assistance to Level 4 districts and schools were supported with RTTT and state targeted assistance resources. These resources provided the state's highest need schools and districts with assistance through Priority Partners, training and support for implementing the state's new Educator Evaluation system and support for WrapAround Zones. State assistance funds also provided resources for certain targeted assistance staff for both the Commissioner's Districts and the DSACs as well as selected turnaround support for high need districts. Finally, grants to DSAC districts included funds from state targeted assistance funds and Title IIb.

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	367,007
Applied to transfer	1,315
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	939
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	\$ 35,165,474

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	159

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	181,644
Applied for supplemental educational services	15,967
Received supplemental educational services	13,518
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	\$ 30,043,710
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	339,887	332,477	97.82	7,410	2.18
All elementary classes	225,675	221,416	98.11	4,259	1.89
All secondary classes	114,212	111,061	97.24	3,151	2.76

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.

Self contained elementary classrooms are weighted by a factor of five to account each core subject taught.
--

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	50.20
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	8.20
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	41.60
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "Other" option was used because the ESE does not collect alternative route program information through our Education Personnel Information Management System, which is the source of the data above. Therefore, the data represented in "Other" are those teachers who are not fully certified, but their alternative program status is unknown.

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)	46.90
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	12.90
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	40.20
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "Other" option was used because the ESE does not collect alternative route program information through our Education Personnel Information Management System, which is the source of the data above. Therefore, the data represented in "Other" are those teachers who are not fully certified, but their alternative program status is unknown.

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	62,320	59,751	95.88
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	52,468	52,061	99.22
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	23,438	22,163	94.56
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	32,659	32,332	99.00

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	58.90	10.50
Poverty metric used	Eligibility for Free or Reduced Price Lunch	
Secondary schools	60.70	13.00
Poverty metric used	Eligibility for Free or Reduced Price 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, Portuguese
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	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"/> No	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	71,626
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.	61,196
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	37,972
Portuguese	4,465
Haitian; Haitian Creole	4,042
Chinese	3,680
Creoles and pidgins, Portuguese-based (Other)	3,334

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	67,568
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,058
Total	71,626
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified and are accurate.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	27,899
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	41.29
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	57,839
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,357
Total	61,196
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified and are accurate.	

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.	9,917

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	31,732	66.22	35,860	62.00
Attained proficiency	24,887	43.03	23,136	40.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
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)
Spanish (grade 10 only)
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)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. None.

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)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. None.

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
7,765	959	8,724
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,660	S	53	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,649	S	62	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 monitored former LEP(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 monitored former LEP 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
3,086	S	33	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	64
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	14
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	45
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	47
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	15
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	4
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	45
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	36

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.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u> </u> No
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
20,974	14,460	11

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) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course - (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.	1,321
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	500

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	56	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	5	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	104	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	19	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	25	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	80	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	93	191
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	40	15
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	3	
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community based organization personnel		
Total	136	206

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

*All numbers in this column are based on Title III grant submissions concerning planned PD for the FY12 grant year, which ran 9/1/11-8/31/12, including carryover of FY11 funds. Exact figures cannot be verified at this time. ESE intends to collect this data as part of district Title III evaluation activities in order to better respond to these inquiries in the future.

**Most districts did not provide specific census information as to how many teachers would benefit from proposed PD.

***Some districts may be captured more than once in these totals. ALL LEAs (including consortia LEAs) that received FY12 Title III grants proposed some type of PD in their FY12 grants, therefore, the figure of 93 was used.

This chart does not cover all PD offered by the OELAAA office to all Title III districts, including the following: common core and math for ELLs, academic language, socioemotional conference with speakers from UMass and the State Police, trauma and learning, and using data to improve instruction of ELLs. In addition, and in response to findings in the recent Title III monitoring visit, the OELAAA office provided several PD sessions at the annual MATSOL conference and held a mandatory Title III conference for all Title III districts in May 2012. Finally, the OELAAA office offered professional development to private schools in Massachusetts so they could understand Title III opportunities.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/5/12	7/27/12	22
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.

Individual meetings, monthly Title III conference calls and emails have been used to provide technical assistance and further compliance with Title III requirements so that the time between submission and approval of grants can be shortened. As a result of the November 30, 2011 Title III monitoring visit report, ESE intends to offer further technical assistance sessions in the spring 2013. ESE has implemented in FY13 a new immigrant grant application process to ensure that Title III funds are properly allocated under the entitlement and immigrant subgrant guidelines. ESE has found that this has expedited grant approvals. ESE continues to implement a provisional approval process under which districts may access Title III funds while outstanding requirements are satisfied. A short timeline is given to districts granted provisional approval, based on individual LEA circumstances, in order to complete additional requirements. In addition, a deadline was used in FY13, in order to permit the timely reallocation of funds.

The Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement intends to implement the following efforts:

- Continue to work on remedying findings identified by the federal monitoring visit report.
- Explore means of expediting the grant application and approval processes with the new grants management system, expected to be in place for FY14.

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	381	360
LEAs with subgrants	23	23
Total		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	95	242
K	430	974
1	427	1,017
2	370	871
3	340	804
4	318	777
5	293	749
6	287	709
7	332	738
8	362	735
9	496	839
10	411	601
11	350	593
12	366	529
Ungraded	9	2
Total	4,886	10,180

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,768	3,585
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,063	4,863
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	37	17
Hotels/Motels	1,018	1,715
Total	4,886	10,180

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)	231
K	930
1	978
2	822
3	762
4	739
5	709
6	665
7	691
8	701
9	783
10	573
11	551
12	491
Ungraded	2
Total	9,628
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	449
Migratory children/youth	5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,480
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,898
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	973	278
4	915	215
5	889	222
6	857	247
7	876	335
8	917	427
High School	719	463

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	984	287
4	937	148
5	888	204
6	866	212
7	901	138
8	909	148
High School	700	320

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

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	885	164
6		
7		
8	899	87
High School	774	263

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)	106
K	46
1	27
2	19
3	12
4	7
5	18
6	12
7	8
8	9
9	11
10	5
11	8
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	132
Total	421
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 decrease in this year's Category 1 count of 421 compared to last year's Category 1 count of 437 is 16 which represents a decrease of 3.7%. No explanation is required.

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)	51
K	32
1	14
2	12
3	7
4	5
5	9
6	8
7	3
8	6
9	4
10	3
11	3
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	37
Total	194
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 increase in this year's Category 2 count of 194 over last year's Category 2 count of 164 is 30 which represents an increase of 18.3%. This increase is due to concerted efforts of the migrant staff to provide additional service. Particular emphasis was placed upon providing services to middle and high school student population and improved parental involvement and accountability.

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.

Massachusetts used a proprietary student information system to compile the Category 1 and Category 2 Counts. This system was developed exclusively for the Massachusetts Migrant Education Program using FileMaker Pro software. Last year's child counts 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.

The identification and recruitment of migrant children is the primary role of MMEP Community Liaisons and is conducted twelve months a year. The Community Liaisons make the initial direct, face-to-face contact with the potentially eligible migrant family, obtain eligibility information, record the eligibility information on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE), and have the primary responsibility for the determination and documentation of student eligibility. The Massachusetts Certificate of Eligibility includes the National COE verbatim with some additional items. The Community Liaisons are also responsible for updating the COE as needed throughout the term of eligibility to record changes in status (change of grade, contact information, etc.), and to verify eligibility on an annual basis.

Day-to-day supervision of the Community Liaisons and implementation of identification and recruitment efforts are the responsibility of the MMEP's three Regional Directors, who are each, in turn, assisted by a team leader, or "verifier", who helps with the verification of all paperwork submitted. Primary responsibility for system planning, policy, and interstate/intrastate coordination is assigned to the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator who is directly supervised by the State Director. Through this structure, the identification and recruitment component provides for regional supervision and coordination of identification and recruitment (Community Liaisons) while maintaining a centralized planning and monitoring system designed to ensure strict compliance with federal student eligibility requirements.

When potentially eligible migrant families have been located, the Community Liaisons ascertain eligibility through structured face-to-face interviews with the parents or guardians or with the out of school youth. Residency is confirmed in this initial face-to-face COE interview, or in subsequent eligibility years, via face-to-face interviews for the purposes of annually updating the COE. Once eligibility is determined, Community Liaisons complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and submit it for review and verification by the Regional Director and his/her "verifier." This documentation is reviewed once again by the ID & R Coordinator who both validates the paperwork with desk audits and face-to-face interviews of families and/or OSY who have been declared eligible.

At the point of identification, the Community Liaisons are required to recognize the family as being "new", "adding additional children" who joined the family after the QAD, or "enrolled previously". Between September and November each year, Community Liaisons interview every active eligible family during a face-to-face meeting to recheck and update the information on the COE.

The Community Liaisons are required to complete paper COE data sections on family (ethnicity, home language, father's last name, mother's last name, current address, current telephone number, school district), child[ren] (name, sex, birth date, school, grade, special services) and qualifying eligibility (date children moved from last city and date they arrived in current city, who they moved with or joined), in the case of an out of school youth, (all information mentioned above and the date they moved and arrived is noted) who is doing temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing activity, date employment was sought or obtained, name of employer, and other clarifying information.

Community Liaisons are required to complete a data section on the standard COE on "Previous Qualifying Move(s), Activities, Address(es)". This provides information in addition to the QAD --- not only to substantiate the eligibility and to document residency, but also to identify families who may have made a migrant move within the Commonwealth and across programmatic Regions. This measure and other verification and validation measures are implemented to preclude the duplication of a family in the program's database. When Community Liaisons submit a COE to the verifier in the region, the verifier has authorization and is required to perform a nation-wide search in MSIX to try to find any records that qualify the family for migrant services. The existence of a record for the family can contribute in a positive way to eligibility determination, can eliminate uncertainty about duplication, can lead to the transfer of existing educational records, and may contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of migrancy of the family. A comment is included on every COE concerning the result of the search in MSIX. When a positive match is found, the MSIX system is used to request interstate information.

To preclude the possibility of creating duplicate records in the MMEP Family database, the MMEP Pupil Records Coordinator searches "family last name and first"; "similar name"; "English cognates"; "addresses and telephone numbers". Then the Pupil Records Coordinator searches "student names"; "birth dates"; and "parents names". If the Pupil Records Coordinator finds a single match, she then "pulls" the respective COE from the file drawer, reviews it, and checks the signatures.

If no prior record of the family and student are found in the database, the Records Clerk creates a new record for the family and new records for any students in the family, and inputs the information from the COE to the record(s).

The service providers, who are MMEP employees, document service through daily attendance records and lesson plans. The summer site coordinators review and verify the accuracy of the daily attendance. The attendance sheets are submitted to the Records Clerks in the regional offices at the end of the service period. In most cases the end of the service cycle corresponds to the end of the summer term. For the summer term in 2012, the attendance sheets were submitted to the Records Clerks by the service providers (MMEP Summer Staff) from August 8 through September 1, 2012. The Records Clerks subsequently enter the data into the Components and Enrollments databases for the region. The components and enrollment data includes type of service, beginning and ending dates of service for the child and the number of days and hours the child participated in the summer program.

Prior to the beginning of the summer programs, there is a week-long orientation for all staff. One of the topics addressed is the delivery of acceptable and 'best' practices for what constitutes quality academic services. Subsequently, teachers and other staff are supervised regularly during service delivery by site coordinators (head teachers) and regional directors. In addition, the topic of MMEP services is reviewed at one of the annual statewide trainings which are mandatory for MMEP staff.

Every September, the Community Liaisons visit all families on their caseload to conduct a face-to-face interview for the purposes of updating student information and eligibility information. This information is recorded on an annual update form which is submitted before October 31 to the Pupil Records Coordinator who enters any changes into the Family and Student Record-Keeping system. In the event that changes to student information or eligibility are discovered in the course

of conducting other home visits to the families, the Community Liaisons record the new information on a "Change of Status" form and submit that to the Pupil Records Coordinator who updates the electronic record.

After determining the Category 1 childcount, the data for the Category 2 childcount is collected by looking at all students who received services after the last day of the regular school year and before the first day of the new school year.

The data contained in this Report refers to activities documented between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012.

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.

All eligible families/students/youth are enrolled in the migrant program's principal state database at one centralized location by the MMEP Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the data directly from validated COEs.

Before the Pupil Records Coordinator assigns the unique family and unique child numbers, a search is conducted utilizing the mother's name, the names and dates of birth of the children, and a review of all records under the same last name. No new family can be enrolled into the database without this screen for duplicates. The data system that we use has a built-in capacity to use "wildcards" for single pieces of data: The discovery of a single variable, which matches a child or family, signals to the Pupil Records Coordinator that she must pull the COE and examine the information contained in it and all of the signatures. In this way, duplication of a family/child is prevented.

If the search is negative, the new family is enrolled and a unique family number and a unique student number are assigned by the Pupil Records Coordinator.

The Student and Families databases are downloaded to the MMEP Regions on a monthly basis. Although the program's database can be accessed by regional staff for generating reports, the system restricts the regional staff from having the ability to enroll families/students or update eligibility information. Nonetheless, having access to copies of the electronic database allows for regional staff to review the information for accuracy. Any discrepancies or questions are brought to the attention of the Pupil Records Coordinator so that corrections or additions can be made to the central database, if needed.

The Student Database consists of a collection of discrete records. Using the relational capacity of the system, it is able to track a theoretically infinite number of educational service experiences while maintaining a single unique record for each student.

Student service data is collected and entered into the student enrollment record by regional staff. During the school year and summer, Records Clerks gather the service data and enter it into an Enrollment Database, which is related to the Student Database.

The MMEP administrative staff and records staff have worked with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE - formerly Department of Education) to develop a memorandum of understanding to allow MMEP access to education data collected by DESE. This data, including SIMS (Student Information Management System data), MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System data) and MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment), is integrated into the MMEP student data system for purpose of informing operational decision making, completing and confirming demographic data and to contribute to the pool of data for MSIX (Migrant Student Records Exchange Initiative).

In addition, information is collected and entered into the database on all academic services that a student receives at the summer project site or through home-based services. The student information is forwarded from the Support Center to the Record Clerks located in each Regional Office. The Record Clerks enter enrollment and attendance information into the enrollment database, a separate and distinct relational database.

Two distinct databases - a "student database" and an "enrollment database" - are included in the Support Center's data warehouse. The student database has been organized to ensure that there is only one record per student. The enrollment database, a related database, is used to characterize each incidence of education service. The records in the enrollment database are used to "flag" the student records for inclusion in the Category 2 childcount. The student database is searched for records that meet eligibility criteria, including eligibility for service for at least one day during summer of the report year by QAD; age-eligible; a check that the student has not been terminated before the beginning of that summer; and that the student has not turned three or has confirmation of residency after turning three during the report year. The student database is the primary generator of student counts which ensure the "uniqueness" of each record, thereby avoiding duplication of student records in the counts.

The student database is the source for all student service data presented in reports such as OME's Category 1 and Category 2 Report. Within the student database only a single record exists for each student regardless of the number of services a student receives and despite the possibility of a student being served by more than one Massachusetts Migrant Education Program Region. In this database, an individual student cannot be counted more than once.

When migrant childcounts are requested by local, state or federal sources, the Pupil Records Coordinator conditions the query to the student database to access the information needed. As an example, when Massachusetts needed to generate information for this Migrant Child Count Report (School Year 2011 - 2012), the Pupil Records Coordinator first queried the system for all eligible children between the ages of 3 and 21 who had not graduated from high school, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who resided in Massachusetts between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012. An unduplicated count of 421 Category 1 migrant children was generated from that query. The Pupil Records Coordinator then queried the system for the count of all eligible children between the ages of 3 - 21, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who received MEP-funded services between the last day of the 2011 - 2012 school year and before the first day of the 2012 - 2012 school year and who had not graduated from high school. An unduplicated count of 194 Category 2 migrant children was generated from that query. When an eligible migrant student graduates from high school, the Community Liaison completes a "Change of Status Form" which is then forwarded to the Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the student as now being "inactive" and who enters the student's graduation date as the "termination date".

Queries on the student database for Category 1 and 2 counts include an elaborate screening process. This process prevents the inclusion of three-year-olds whose residency has not been documented (after they turn three) or their termination date from the program. Additional screening prevents children at any age from being included in the count if their residency status has not been documented.

Community Liaisons are alerted by the Records Clerks in advance of the date that potential Category 1 migrant children will turn three. Community Liaisons are asked to visit the family and to update the COE as soon as possible to document residency of all eligible children.

The MMEP Regional Offices, on an on-going basis, provide migrant student lists to all LEAs who are serving migrant students. These lists "flag" the eligible migrant students to assist the LEAs to plan appropriate support for those students and to facilitate the sharing of education information by the school and MMEP region.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for Massachusetts' Category 2 count were not collected nor maintained differently from the Category 1 count. For Category 2 the service data is collected by the service delivery staff, recorded manually on paper, submitted to the regional Records Clerks. The Records Clerks in each region input the data into a set of relational databases in the region. These databases are transmitted to the Migrant Support Center where the service data is incorporated into the MMEP Student Information System. It can be used to flag unique student records in the Student database to facilitate the count. This process is described in greater detail in the preceding section.

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.

Category 1 Count: The Massachusetts Migrant Education Program's student database has a built-in calculation for the expiration of eligibility. To verify the accuracy of the database, on a daily basis the Pupil Records Coordinator does a "find" of active students between the ages of three through twenty-one who had not graduated from high school. If discrepancies are discovered, the Pupil Records Coordinator reviews the COEs and consults the Community Liaisons, the Records Clerks, and/or the Regional Director for a determination of eligibility on those students.

All children turning three during the report period are tested for confirmation of residency after their third birthday---a face-to-face or telephone confirmation must be documented before the child's information can be included in the Category 1 or Category 2 counts. The same system is used for all other migrant students. For a student to be included in the twelve-month Category 1 count, each one of the conditions mentioned above must be satisfied.

The unique student record for every child included in the Category 1 count is 'flagged' for:

- a) being between ages 3 through 21
- b) were within 3 years of a last qualifying move and who's parent or guardian (or in the case of Out of School Youth, they, themselves) moved to participate in a qualifying activity.
- c) were a resident of The Commonwealth of Massachusetts for at least one day.

In order for a student to be included in the Category 2 count, the conditions a) through c) outlined above must be met along with one additional criterion --- that service has been provided through MEP funds (and documented in a related database) after the last day of the 2011 - 2012 school year ended and before the 2011 -2013 school year began.

Please note that (as described in the previous section), if a child is determined to have turned three during the report period, they are only included in the count if they meet the following conditions:

- a) Their residency in the Commonwealth for at least one day after turning three can be verified.
- b) Their eligibility expiration date is confirmed to occur after they turned three.
- c) They have not been terminated for any other reason prior to turning three. And in the case of the category 2 count,
- d) At least one day of service within the report period was provided after they turned three.

The boolean functions of the database (which contains a unique record for every student) are conditioned to the above criteria to yield counts that are precise and unduplicated. Because of the systematic approach to ensuring the uniqueness of each record in the Student database from which the counts are derived, the children can only be counted once per age/grade level for each child count category.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The written quality control was reviewed and revised in 2011. The plan was incorporated into the ID&R manual and training was provided to all staff in May, 2011. The quality control system consists of four phases and involved at least two individuals who shared responsibility for the review and monitoring of eligibility determinations. That system is described below:

Phase One: Quality control begins with quality training. Each year Community Liaisons are required to attend (a) training sessions which review technical guides/reports, federal guidelines regarding eligibility, the state Identification and Recruitment Manual and (b) additional training in interviewing techniques, information on welfare reform, education reform, access to social and human services, CHIPs information, and other information that impacts migrant families. In 2010, 2011, and 2012 MMEP conducted Statewide Identification and Recruitment training which was mandated for all staff. (c) Each year Community Liaisons/Recruiters and other MMEP staff involved in the identification and recruitment process are required to pass a competency test in order to demonstrate requisite knowledge of all ID & R procedures and eligibility guidelines. Newly hired Community Liaisons must participate in an intensive orientation and demonstrate competency through an examination prior to working on their own. A process is in place to provide clarity and guidance in instances when an eligibility question is raised that might be specific both to a particular situation or region and that pertains to the entire state. The system ensures that all involved staff receive consistent information, and it documents that the information has been received and reviewed.

Phase Two: Community Liaisons submit the completed COEs to their Regional Director. All COEs are reviewed by the Regional Directors to determine if the eligibility determination was correct and creditable and that the COE was accurate and complete. To facilitate the verification process, the Regional Directors update information on the major agricultural and fishing activities within their Region on a routine basis. If there are questions about information on COEs, the COEs are returned to the Community Liaisons for correction or further explanation. Please note that as stated previously, the MMEP COE incorporates the National COE verbatim.

Phase Three: Regional Directors submit their COEs to the Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator. All COEs are validated by the ID&R Coordinator to authorize student enrollment into the migrant program's student database. The review at this stage ensures that the eligibility of children considered to be migratory was properly documented and verified and that the eligibility data was creditable. If there are questions about information on the COEs, the COEs are returned to the Regional Directors for correction or further explanation.

Phase Four: The final quality control process--auditing--is done by the ID&R Coordinator on a "pre-enrollment" basis. During this phase, on a random sample basis, COEs of each Community Liaison are "field audited" (by telephone, letter, a home visit, a public school visit, and/or an employer visit) to ensure that both the identification and recruitment and information management systems are functioning properly. The ID&R Coordinator reviews all questionable COEs with the MMEP State Director. It is the State Director who, in these rare cases, is the final arbitrator and determines whether the family/children are migratory and should be enrolled in the MMEP's student information database.

In September, 2009, the MMEP implemented the National COE and trained all staff in it's use.

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.

As stated elsewhere in this report, every COE is reviewed at the regional office and verified by the regional director whose signature on the second page of the form indicates that to the best of his/her knowledge the information is accurate. Within 5-10 days of receipt of a regionally verified COE at the Migrant Support Center, the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator would visit the residence or place of employment of the identified migrant in order to conduct a review. The review may take the form of Face-to-face interviews with the worker, phone audits, employer verifications, school verifications, and paystub verifications.

For the report period of September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012, more than 85% of statewide verified Certificates of Eligibility

(COEs) were subject to a review procedure to ensure a high level of quality control prior to their entry into the database.

All face-to-face interview sessions are attended by the Community Liaison/Recruiter and ID&R Coordinator. In the course of a face-to-face interview session and in the case of a phone audit every item recorded on the eligibility section of the COE and the Out of School Youth's age is reviewed for consistency and accuracy.

If the information on the COE is found to be consistent and accurate by the re-interviewing authority, the positive result of the re-interview session is noted on an independent form (Basic Interviewing Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form). If the information on the COE is found to be inconsistent with the re-interview and/or found to be inaccurate, the COE would be rejected and the family deemed ineligible for services under Migrant Education and the family is notified that they are ineligible for services. For those cases in which the COE is rejected, the ID&R Coordinator follows-up with the Community Liaison and Recruiter to clarify any potential misunderstandings about eligibility guidelines.

A quality control sheet (Basic Interview Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form) is used to record the results of the audit (re- interview) visit. This quality control form is completed by the ID&R Coordinator, then attached and filed with the original COE.

Number of eligibility determinations sampled 110

Number for which a test was completed 110

Number found eligible 110

In Massachusetts in the 2011-12 school year, more than 85% of the COEs were reviewed and of those, 75% were subject to an internal re-interview process either via face-to-face interview or by phone. The selection of the sample was not random; rather, the MMEP prioritized certain COEs based on a variety of criteria. Some of the criteria included, new Community Liaison/Recruiters, instances where the Community Liaison/Recruiter had posed questions about the information collected during the interview, COEs with numerous "comments", moving to the state at an unusual time of the year, etc. The review sample was selected based upon the COE.

Once every three years the MMEP coordinates an independent re-interview. During this report year, the Migrant Education Training and Support Group (METS) was contracted to conduct a systematic and comprehensive independent re-interview of families who had been determined eligible over the course of the prior year. The METS was contracted to conduct the independent re-interviews based upon their familiarity with identification and recruitment and eligibility requirements for the MEP, and their ability to conduct the re-interviews in a second language (Spanish). The random sample of 56 (building in a margin of 6 for attrition) COE's were pulled from the files, by using an established and statistically sound randomization procedure, executed upon the entire pool of eligible students (by ID number). A standard instrument was used and a protocol containing all criteria used in making eligibility determinations was developed and employed systematically. The MMEP provided orientation, guidance, and logistical support to facilitate an effective and efficient process (e.g. mapping locations and scheduling times to group families in close geographical proximity). The MEP staff assisted the re-interviewer to navigate throughout the state but to ensure the independence and integrity of the process no staff were present when the re-interviews were conducted. Over the course of five days in July, 2011, the eligibility for 50 students was independently confirmed. The response rate of 89% (50/56) for face-to-face (44) and telephone (6) interviews allowed the re-interviewer to achieve the target of independently re-interviewing 50 families or out-of-school youth. In addition, the independent re- interviewer using other available resources was able to corroborate the eligibility of the remaining six families and out of school youth. Those six cases were found to be beyond reach for a) medical emergency, b) inability to make contact, or c) declined interview.

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.

Throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator (a single person acting at the State level), follows a protocol of "pulling" COEs on a random sample basis to review and verify the information in the Student Database against the COE; when entering information from the COE Update Forms into the Database, spot checks are implemented, such as a review of family and child unique numbers, and other data that has already been entered into the database; and on a daily basis manual confirmation on the eligibility expiration date of all students is completed. In addition, at the MMEP Regional Offices, the Records Clerks are also reviewing COE data against COE "update data" for accuracy on an on-going basis.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The final steps taken by the Pupil Records Coordinator are (1) to audit a sample of student records and pull the COEs to confirm the eligibility through an examination of the "hard copy" documentation and (2) through the system's built-in programs of "finds" and "sorts", to try to replicate the student counts by using different methodologies. All summer services provided to eligible students through MEP-funding are provided by the MMEP.

The accuracy of the summer service data is assured in a variety of ways. MMEP summer staff are provided with written material and training that provide background about the migrant program, service delivery, and the procedures for recording service accurately. Attendance is recorded by the teachers, reviewed by the on-site coordinators, and quality control checked by the Regional Directors. During the State Directors visits to the summer programs, both announced and unannounced, attendance records are reviewed. In addition, summer program attendance sheets are reconciled with the attendance register submitted to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) summer food program. The DESE monitor for the summer food program conducts a formal attendance review at the end of the summer session to ensure accuracy of the MMEP reports. These supervisory and monitoring visits ensure that attendance data are reported accurately.

Direct service providers (MMEP instructional staff) are trained to understand the needs of the migrant students and expectations about the nature and quality of academic service to be provided in the MEP classroom. Every year the EDCO Director of Technology retrains the records clerks on compiling and reporting student enrollment using the relational database system that he developed for that purpose. The records clerks are given support by phone and in-person regarding the translation of attendance records into discreet units of service for purposes of reporting. In the course of this support the actual practice of translating attendance records into service categories is reviewed. Attendance is carefully reviewed as a matter of course in site supervision described above.

Information that is reviewed throughout the year is contained in the COEs and in the MMEP permission forms. The standard procedure for identifying the records to be included in the count relies on calculation fields in the student database which flag records that meet specific criteria via boolean operations on data in fields from the student database as well as fields from other related databases. For example one of the set of flag fields used in executing the Category 1 eligibility count, marks a record if the child's QAD was within three years of the beginning of the report period and if a termination date for that child exists, only if the termination occurred after the beginning of the report period. One strategy used to check the accuracy of that flag is to find all student records with a QAD that falls within the acceptable range for the report year. This group of records is then sorted using the flag field as well as the termination date field and any irregularities can be observed by examining each record. Although this process seems cumbersome, the sort accelerates the process. There will be a series of records, which represent active students with no termination date and, if the flag is observed to be behaving properly, these records may be dispensed with rather quickly. Similarly those records having termination dates after the beginning of the report period should also be flagged and this can rapidly be confirmed.

The remaining records should not be flagged and should represent records with termination dates prior to the beginning of the report period. Due to the sort order, the borders for each series are predictable and can be readily identified. Those records in proximity to the borders may be examined more carefully for irregularities, such as unexpected flags or absence of flags. After the found set is satisfactorily examined the omitted records are sorted and examined similarly. Any flagged records in this set would indicate the existence of false positives in which an QAD would be outside of the acceptable three- year range. This is just one example of how a series of finds and sorts combined with scanning of individual records are used to confirm the validity of the compiled data.

Twice per month throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator generates a child count report and submits it to the State Director. This report is reviewed by the State Director and the Regional Directors and compared against previous child counts and recruitment targets. In addition the State Director compares CSPR child counts to these bimonthly tallies, to the child counts from the previous year, and reviews the performance report for internal consistency to assure reasonableness of the counts.

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.

As a result of Massachusetts' statewide re-interviewing initiative in 2006, the MMEP has taken steps to refine and improve upon the quality control exercised over the recruitment and identification of eligible migrant students. The revised framework for monitoring the accuracy of our work is detailed below.

Briefly described, the new framework introduces an additional layer of oversight during the work of recruiting eligible migrant children. Instead of leaving quality control exclusively in the hands of the MMEP Support Center, each region now calls upon "verifiers" to assist in the process. Verifiers review the paperwork of the COE, confer with Regional Directors, and then together sign off on the accuracy and thoroughness of the COEs being submitted to the Support Center. The

objective here, in addition, to having an extra set of "eyes" to review the paperwork is to proactively identify any potential errors and/or misidentified families well before they are declared eligible. In so doing, verifiers also free additional time for Support Center personnel to conduct more face-to-face re-interviews of families. The need for more face-to-face re-interviews was one of the recommendations to surface in the Statewide Director's Re-interviewing Report to OME in 2006.

The flow chart outlined in the "Conceptual Framework" calls for CLs to submit their COEs to a verifier who then use MMEPs existing standards for quality control to check the COEs for accuracy.

In addition to making use of these standards, Verifiers also complete the Regional COE Verification Form, attaching it to the COE, once reviewed. Finally, after conferring with CLs, as needed, verifiers then confer once again with the Regional Directors before he/she signs off on the COE and sends it to the Support Center.

COEs submitted by the Regional Directors then undergo a process of "validation" by the ID& R Coordinator and staff at the Support Center. Validation activities, among other things, consist of telephone checks of schools and employers, and face- to-face re-interviews on a systematic basis throughout each school year. In the event that a COE and/or family is discovered to be ineligible for service, Support Staff send a MMEP Failure to Validate Form (and other documents) back to the Regional Director and Verifier, informing them of the change in status. MMEP continues to strengthen the comprehensive quality control training program launched in 2007. Components include Statewide training for recruiters, community liaisons and regional staff; Supplemental training by outside providers, an annual competency exam for Community Liaisons as well as all MMEP staff involved in the eligibility determination process, and systematic administrative review of all Identification and Recruitment policies and procedures.

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.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts nor the underlying eligibility determinations upon which the counts are based.