

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**

MAINE



**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: Maine	
Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0023	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Rachelle Tome	
Telephone: 207-624-6708	
Fax: 207-624-6706	
e-mail: rachelle.tome@maine.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Rachelle Tome	
_____ Signature	_____ Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 4:57:41 PM

This section of the 2011-12 CSPR was certified by Rachelle Tome rachelle.tome@maine.gov 207-624-6708

**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.

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

State has revised or changed

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2013-2014	2013-2014	2014-2015

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:

N/A

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

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

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

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

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

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017

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:

N/A

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

<p style="text-align: center;">State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

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

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters:

<p>N/A</p>

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)	30.00
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. The remaining 10% of the allocation is spread across the list of activities described in 1.1.3.2	

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

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	95,702	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	770	98
Asian	S	1,510	>=99
Black or African American	S	2,736	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,477	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	94	>=95
White	S	88,102	>=99
Two or more races	S	1,013	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	15,731	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,694	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	42,467	98
Migratory students	S	43	>=95
Male	S	49,200	>=99
Female	S	46,502	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Whole group and all subgroups are above 95%.			

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	3,181	20.22
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,074	70.40
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,476	9.38
Total	15,731	////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Children with disabilities participating at 97%.		

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	95,671	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	771	98
Asian	S	1,495	98
Black or African American	S	2,695	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,470	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	94	>=95
White	S	88,132	>=99
Two or more races	S	1,014	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	15,753	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,618	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	42,432	98
Migratory students	S	43	>=95
Male	S	49,187	>=99
Female	S	46,484	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Whole group and all subgroups are above 95%.

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	42
--	----

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	3,182	20.20
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,047	70.13
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,524	9.67
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	0.00
Total	15,753	////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	41,282	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	322	>=99
Asian	S	687	97
Black or African American	S	1,133	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	641	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	42	>=95
White	S	38,056	98
Two or more races	S	397	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	6,547	96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	1,084	96
Economically disadvantaged students	S	17,131	97
Migratory students	S	23	>=90
Male	S	21,220	98
Female	S	20,058	98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Whole group and all subgroups are above 95%.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,742	26.61
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,181	63.86
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	624	9.53
Total	6,547	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Children with disabilities participating at 96%.		

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	13,242	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	S	54
Asian	208	S	70
Black or African American	407	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	240	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	S	67
White	12,111	S	65
Two or more races	152	S	60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,125	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	409	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	6,217	S	52
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	6,870	S	65
Female	6,372	S	63

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 200 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	13,227	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	S	65
Asian	206	S	76
Black or African American	399	S	47
Hispanic or Latino	239	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	S	>=80
White	12,107	S	73
Two or more races	152	S	68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,120	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	395	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	6,203	S	62
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	6,862	S	68
Female	6,365	S	77

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 200 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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. Maine does not test Science 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	13,309	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	115	S	57
Asian	197	S	72
Black or African American	415	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	225	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	12	S	58
White	12,188	S	67
Two or more races	157	S	63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,276	S	37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	401	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	6,338	S	54
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	6,816	S	67
Female	6,493	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 200 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	13,314	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	115	S	57
Asian	195	S	77
Black or African American	411	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	224	S	60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	12	S	58
White	12,199	S	72
Two or more races	158	S	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,282	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	393	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	6,339	S	60
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	6,821	S	67
Female	6,493	S	75

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 200 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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. Maine does not assess Science in grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	13,652	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	121	S	55
Asian	244	S	70
Black or African American	401	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	234	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	S	73
White	12,481	S	65
Two or more races	156	S	63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,343	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	459	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	6,329	S	51
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,089	S	64
Female	6,563	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	13,641	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	120	S	48
Asian	241	S	75
Black or African American	395	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	231	S	60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	S	73
White	12,483	S	69
Two or more races	156	S	66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,342	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	445	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	6,319	S	57
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,085	S	63
Female	6,556	S	75

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories. Additionally, the changing demographic of Maine's EL community has resulted in these data deltas.

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	13,614	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	120	S	48
Asian	245	S	62
Black or African American	402	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	245	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	16	S	56
White	12,421	S	63
Two or more races	164	S	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,401	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	436	S	25
Economically disadvantaged students	6,355	S	49
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,079	S	62
Female	6,534	S	61

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories. We are investigating the 1 student discreptency in the gender vs whole group comparison.

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	13,757	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	103	S	52
Asian	210	S	73
Black or African American	408	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	193	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	19	S	>=80
White	12,670	S	66
Two or more races	154	S	62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,474	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	406	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	6,332	S	51
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,060	S	64
Female	6,697	S	64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 200 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	13,748	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	103	S	62
Asian	208	S	75
Black or African American	399	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	193	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	19	S	>=80
White	12,672	S	73
Two or more races	154	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,476	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	394	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	6,324	S	61
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,053	S	67
Female	6,695	S	78

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories. Additionally, the changing demographic of Maine's EL community has resulted in these data deltas.

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. Maine does not test science in grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,023	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	119	S	47
Asian	207	S	65
Black or African American	391	S	34
Hispanic or Latino	187	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	64
White	12,943	S	62
Two or more races	165	S	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,404	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	367	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	6,414	S	47
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,260	S	61
Female	6,763	S	60

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 200 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	14,007	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	121	S	60
Asian	202	S	73
Black or African American	379	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	186	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	73
White	12,943	S	71
Two or more races	165	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,408	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	347	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	6,404	S	59
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,254	S	65
Female	6,753	S	75

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 200 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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. Maine does not test science in grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,234	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	108	S	42
Asian	236	S	67
Black or African American	384	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	204	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	73
White	13,155	S	61
Two or more races	136	S	59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,289	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	391	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	6,136	S	45
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,225	S	58
Female	7,009	S	62

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories. Additionally, the changing demographic of Maine's EL community has resulted in these data deltas.

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	14,252	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	108	S	66
Asian	236	S	77
Black or African American	381	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	205	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	>=80
White	13,175	S	78
Two or more races	136	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,303	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	385	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	6,147	S	66
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	7,237	S	71
Female	7,015	S	83

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories. Additionally, the changing demographic of Maine's EL community has resulted in these data deltas.

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	14,161	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	103	S	59
Asian	235	S	69
Black or African American	391	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	203	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	S	54
White	13,072	S	72
Two or more races	141	S	65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,272	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	380	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	6,034	S	58
Migratory students	10	S	40
Male	7,219	S	73
Female	6,939	S	69

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories. Additionally, the changing demographic of Maine's EL community has resulted in these data deltas. We are investigating the 1 student discrepancy between the whole group and the gender sub groups.

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	13,485	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	95	S	33
Asian	208	S	54
Black or African American	330	S	21
Hispanic or Latino	194	S	32
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	73
White	12,554	S	48
Two or more races	93	S	33
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,820	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	261	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,701	S	30
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	6,880	S	47.25
Female	6,605	S	46.28

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	13,482	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	95	S	35
Asian	207	S	48
Black or African American	331	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	192	S	30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	55
White	12,553	S	48
Two or more races	93	S	44
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,822	S	16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	259	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,696	S	31
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	6,875	S	43
Female	6,607	S	51

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	13,507	S	44
American Indian or Alaska Native	99	S	34
Asian	207	S	44
Black or African American	340	S	20
Hispanic or Latino	193	S	31
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	S	54
White	12,563	S	45
Two or more races	92	S	37
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,874	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	268	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,742	S	29
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	6,922	S	48
Female	6,585	S	39

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The n size of each subgroup highlighted is very small (less than 300 in each case) and as such is highly variable when applied across proficiency categories.

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	585	257	43.93
Districts	180	144	80.00

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	380	196	51.58
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	66	27	40.91
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	314	169	53.82

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changes were due to increasing AMOs.

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
157	126	80.25

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	10
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	94
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the blanks in the chart, there were 0 schools implementing those actions.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the blanks in the chart, there were 0 schools implementing those actions.	

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.

Schools entering year two (restructuring), in addition to enlisting the support of an outside expert to facilitate the change process, also implemented a number of change efforts, designed to restructure the internal organization of the school and reorganize the school's governance.

These major restructuring efforts include:

1. Restructuring of the school day and year to allow for the implementation an educational "teaming" approach across discipline teams to share best practices and resources. Additionally these restructuring efforts, facilitate the creation of extra time for educators to meet in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), to receive additional professional development and training and reflect on best practices.

2. Reorganization of the schools administrative structures, to improve the level of teacher involvement in school governance responsibilities. Examples would include: shared decision making and full involvement and participation of teachers in the development of the schools restructuring plan, with the express purpose of enabling the school to make AYP.

3. School leadership received additional professional development training around the topic of school governance and

were reviewed using peer based performance evaluations, designed to produce thoughtful reflection on administrative practices.

4. The role of the parent is redefined, to be seen as a more active and engaged participant in school governance, to increase investment and shared decision making .

5. School administration, teachers and parents work together, as a cohesive leadership team, with the direct purpose to improving student achievement in the classroom.

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.

SEA Title I staff provide ongoing technical assistance for districts identified. This support includes onsite meetings and/or conference calls as needed. Support activities include reviewing data to identify root causes for achievement challenges. Technical assistance also includes a review of activities planned for professional development and parental involvement in all schools. Improvement efforts undertaken at any Title I schools in improvement status are also reviewed to ensure consistency in programming.

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	6
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	1
Schools	15	5
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	10/31/20
---	----------

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 5% reservation from 1003(g) was used to support technical assistance and evaluation activities for the 9 identified SIG schools. Funds were used to provide three part-time consultants who act as liaisons between Maine's SIG schools and MDOE. These consultants facilitate regularly scheduled support sessions for our SIG principals through a Transformational Principal's Network. In addition to on-site face -to -face meeting, technical assistance and phone conferences were provided as needed. Funds also supported the travel costs for monitoring and evaluation activities, which included site visits and phone conferences, in addition to the submission of performance reports. Funds were also utilized to support the addition and implementation of INDISTAR, an online system for planning and tracking school improvement activities, and for reporting the leading and lagging indicators of school improvement.

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.

In addition to activities supported by 1003(a) and 1003(g), Title I schools in improvement status participated in applicable statewide conferences and workshops focusing on a variety of educational topics including: administration of statewide assessments, including NECAP, MHSA, PAAP, WIDA ACCESS, review of Common Core, data driven decision making, standards based instruction, high school syllabus review, Response to Intervention, student assistance teams and training for effective integration of technology with Maine's Laptop Initiative (MLTI).

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	29,444
Applied to transfer	194
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	186
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	\$ 40,816

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	34

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	8,020
Applied for supplemental educational services	781
Received supplemental educational services	753
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	\$ 685,029
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	63,882	61,810	96.76	222	0.35
All elementary classes	24,172	23,950	99.08	222	0.92
All secondary classes	39,710	37,860	95.34	1,850	4.66

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class. The only time elementary classes are counted using the departmentalized approach is when students leave the self-contained classroom for a period of instruction in specials (such as visual or performing arts or world languages).
--

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	34.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	24.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	21.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	21.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Provisional or conditional certificate
 Long-term substitute
 Approved alternative route to certification
 State waiver for certification
 Visual and performing arts teachers in small island school qualified but not certified
 Inexperienced first-year teacher
 Coursework needed

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)	76.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	7.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Provisional, transitional or conditional certificate
 Re-assigned to a new content area and working toward
 HQT Approved alternative route to certification
 Inexperienced first-year teacher
 State waiver for certification
 Long-term substitute is not certified
 Multiple teaching assignments but only HQT for one

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	4,822	4,731	98.11
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	5,159	5,128	99.40
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	5,974	5,857	98.04
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	8,488	8,327	98.10

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	63.50	36.70
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	53.60	30.20
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	French
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Two-way immersion	French
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Heritage language	Passamaquoddy
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	2,253
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in Maine's Education Data Warehouse was erroneous but is being corrected. The Stat's contractor, Choice Solution, had used the School Funding counts. These counts did not include publicly funded students that were attending private special purpose schools. This created a significant discrepancy. Since they can not "fix" the submissions for at least a couple weeks, Maine will resubmit once it is fixed and verified.	

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.	4,014
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in Maine's Education Data Warehouse was erroneous but is being corrected. The Stat's contractor, Choice Solution, had used the School Funding counts. These counts did not include publicly funded students that were attending private special purpose schools. This created a significant discrepancy. Since they can not "fix" the submissions for at least a couple weeks, Maine will resubmit once it is fixed and verified.	

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
Somali	802
Spanish; Castilian	226
French	191
Central Khmer	130
Algonquian languages	117

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	4,928
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	275
Total	5,203
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state continues to struggle with English learners (ELs) not able to participate in all domains e.g. deaf ELs, which provides a "false" not tested. In addition, high school ELs due to schedules and attitude do not participate in ALL domains and absenteeism affects the total because all domains are not always administered on the same day. Non participation in ALL domains contributes greatly to the Total not tested.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,369
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	27.78
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	4,156
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	159
Total	4,315
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The low numbers come from our official October 1 student count. They represent those students categorized as LEP at that time. The high number results from waiting to later in the year at testing time. At that point in the school year more students may have been identified as LEP or potentially LEP. The higher count includes this as well as all students tested, whether or not testing shows them to be LEP.</p> <p>The state continues to struggle with English learners (ELs) not able to participate in all domains e.g. deaf ELs, which provides a "false" not tested. In addition, high school ELs due to schedules and attitude do not participate in ALL domains and absenteeism affects the total because all domains are not always administered on the same day. Non participation in ALL domains contributes greatly to the Total not tested.</p>	

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

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.	0

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	3,287	79.09	2,404	55.70
Attained proficiency	1,139	27.41	1,031	23.90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
none
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)
none
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
none
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
153	98	251
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
231	S	69	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
231	S	84	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
136	S	56	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	13
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	2
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	2
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	12
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	13
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	5
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	2

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. Maine counts all the members of a consortium as one (1) single subgrantee

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Maine met AMAOs II and III but did Not Meet AMAO I	

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
465	3	1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	105
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	58

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	13	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	13	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	13	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	12	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	13	1,546
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	13	224
PD provided to principals	13	95
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	13	115
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	13	573
PD provided to community based organization personnel	9	44
Total	74	2,597

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	08/01/11	30
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.

The process shortens if a subgrantee submits its required performance report and application as soon as funds are allocated to the state.

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://1/www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are no schools identified as persistently dangerous.	

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	182	182
LEAs with subgrants	3	3
Total	185	185
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)	15	1
K	62	28
1	83	48
2	74	51
3	73	34
4	70	35
5	70	30
6	66	38
7	68	29
8	58	32
9	77	38
10	95	47
11	109	41
12	156	66
Ungraded		
Total	1,076	518

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are no students in ungraded level. These system needs to show 0 for data.

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	203	263
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	688	198
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	43	8
Hotels/Motels	142	49
Total	1,076	518

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	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	28
1	48
2	51
3	34
4	34
5	30
6	38
7	29
8	32
9	38
10	47
11	41
12	66
Ungraded	0
Total	517
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	234
Migratory children/youth	1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	94
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	176
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	58	31
4	62	27
5	57	22
6	50	21
7	56	19
8	46	25
High School	87	14

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	62	22
4	63	25
5	58	16
6	51	15
7	58	20
8	44	11
High School	86	19

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	83	27
6		
7		
8	60	26
High School	89	14

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The areas with no data should be listed a zero.

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)	22
K	18
1	18
2	18
3	18
4	19
5	21
6	18
7	18
8	20
9	36
10	29
11	26
12	30
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	47
Total	358
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 increase in the number of students reported for Category 1 was less than 10 percent.

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)	14
K	10
1	14
2	10
3	10
4	12
5	15
6	13
7	5
8	8
9	11
10	12
11	7
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	12
Total	160
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 the number of students reported for Category 2 was not greater than 10 percent.

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.

During the 2011-12 reporting period, the SEA obtained eligibility data queries from Maine's MEP MIS2000 system, Maine's MEP system of record. In addition, during the 2011-2012 reporting period, the SEA developed - in collaboration with MIS2000 - a pilot web interface system in order to capture all service data directly from the service providers/Migrant Education Program (MEP) projects. The webinterface simultaneously allowed A) service providers to enter service data only for students linked to their facility/project and B) the SEA to review - in real time - service data and notify service providers of data elements pertinent to each unique student record. Also, each MEP Project captured and collected enrollment, attendance and instructional data elements in their own data management systems, which is utilized by the SEA as the source/raw data. The combinations of the MIS2000 counts and the service providers/MEP Projects' collected data elements generated the reports necessary to establish child counts for both Category 1 and 2. In addition, Category 1 requires interface with the State student information system (Infinite Campus) to determine presence in the Maine School System, dropout, graduation and assessment data. Interface/Cross reference is done by establishing a unique ID common between systems and then running queries to return the desired information. Child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same systems as for the 2011-2012 reporting period. Enhancements to data collection for Category 2 were put in place during 2011-2012 reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

Child count data for Category 1 were collected by Identification and Recruitment MEP staff and temporary recruiting staff via tablet technology/electronic COE.

Data Elements and Sections Collected as required by the national

COE. Category 1 and 2

Personal Data: male and female parent/guardian first and last name; relationship; legal male and female parent last and first name; current address; current phone number (if available); work phone number (if available); permanent address; permanent phone; student name first/middle/last1/last2/suffix grade; birth date; sex; age; place of birth (city/state/country), grade, multibirth flag, race and ethnicity.

Eligibility information:

Origin and destination of move qualifying move: 'From' (District, City, State, Country); 'To' (School District, city, State, country); QA Date (QAD); Current Residency Date; whether the child moved with or joined parents or moved on his/her own; name of qualifying worker; relation to child; in order to obtain qualifying work; temporary/seasonal work; agriculture or fishing industry; specific qualifying activity; reason for temporary (if applicable); basis of temporary determination (if applicable); additional comments (if applicable); signature of parent/guardian or eligible student (if qualifying worker); signature of recruiter; eligibility verification date and signature by state MEP Director or approval authority.

Child count data for Category 2 were collected by Identification and Recruitment Maine MEP staff and temporary recruiting staff via tablet technology/electronic COE. In addition, service providers/MEP Projects collected data elements pertinent to Category 2 in Maine's MIS2000 web interface and their own data management systems. Data elements were submitted to the SEA via Maine's MIS2000 Web Interface, electronic file submissions and paper copies (source/raw data).

MEP Project Data:

Current school or project; date of enrollment; attendance (total days present); type of instruction or services; total days enrolled; withdrawal date. LEP or Special Education designation, graduation and drop out data is extracted from the State Information System.

COLLECTION OF DATA:

METHODOLOGY/PROCESS Category 1

Student demographic and eligibility data elements were collected on electronic COEs by State and temporary recruiters hired and trained by MEP staff and/or ESCORT staff for seasonal recruitment. The data elements were collected by means of personal interviews with parents, guardians and/or workers during the school year and summer in Maine. Recruiters visited worker camps, crop sites, processing plants, homes, and schools to conduct interviews with potentially eligible families and workers. In some cases, preliminary phone interviews were conducted by recruiters to follow-up on school surveys to determine likely eligibility in order to schedule a personal interview to complete the COE.

Maine's MEP hired and deployed seven additional summer ID&R staff. Two 15 week experienced recruiters and an University of Maine intern were hired for the duration of the summer in order to ensure all eligible migratory children and youth were recruited and were provided with the opportunity to access the services they were entitled to receive during Maine's busiest crops, Broccoli and Blueberry Harvest. In addition, during the Blueberry Harvest (first three weeks in August), the SEA hired an additional 3 temporary experienced Summer recruiters and an on site ID&R coordinator through ESCORT. Summer interviews were conducted by teams of two recruiters using an initial screening tool in paper form (the field script), followed by tablet technology and electronic COEs. The recruiter collected and inputted data directly into MIS2000 tablet system; making the process more efficient and effective for the guardian or worker, the recruiter and the reviewer(s). Once a recruiter determined eligibility and entered the information it would be assigned a

pending status; then the the ID&R coordinator would conduct a Tier 1 review followed by the Director or Approval Authority, who reviewed the COE for verification. The data only becomes visible once this approval takes place. Only at that point, the data is populated into the system of record, MIS2000. Any cases with questions, inconsistencies, or missing data would be returned to the previous reviewer for additional clarifications. The system would alert reviewers and the recruiter that the COE was rejected. If the reviewers lack sufficient information to clarify questions or inconsistencies, the COE was returned to the original recruiter, who would have to re-interview the family again.

Category 2:

The Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on the review of data elements included in MEP Projects. The COE is the primary source for data-points in both databases. Additional data elements to populate Category 2 counts are collected by MEP projects via MIS2000 web interface as well as their own individual data management systems (source data). MEP Projects or Service Providers collect enrollment data, (attendance) number of days present and type of provided instruction. Based upon this information, students are flagged "Summer Services" (June 20- Aug 15) and/or "Regular School Year" in data base for inclusion in Category 2 counts.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

Data were collected at the time of enrollment in a MEP program and upon identification of eligible children and/or youth during state-wide recruiting efforts throughout the year. Withdrawal data were collected at the time of outbound moves or, in the case of MEP projects, at the end of the project.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data points are directly inputted by a recruiter into MIS2000 via tablet system/electronic COE. Once a recruiter determines eligibility and enters the information it is assigned a pending status; then the ID&R coordinator reviews the COE. Lastly, the Approval Authority reviews the COE for verification and approval. Additional information collected via MIS2000 web interface - which allows service providers to directly input data in the SEA's system of record - and source data of MEP funded projects (course related instruction and attendance) records were also instrumental in order to finalize Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Updates to data:

Updates to any data-point are conducted by the SEA Approval Authority in Maine's MEP system of record, MIS2000.

The current data maintenance practices and procedures continue to be reviewed and revised in order to generate the most accurate counts and simplify the process for MEP staff.

The SEA's process of eliminating duplicate students within our system of records through three differentiated methods:

- 1) Prior to the inclusion of any individual student records in the system of record; the system alerts the SEA's approval authority or designee of potential duplicates or confirms it as a new, unique, individual student record.
- 2)MSIX email notifications also alert SEA data management staff of potential duplicates. Data staff immediately addresses these alerts in MSIX portal as well as Maine's system of record, MIS2000.
- 3) In addition, the SEA reviews every individual student record for Category 1 and 2 in order ensure there are no duplicates. Then cross references are made with the MEP projects source data. This cross validation process enhances data quality and ensures there are no duplicate students in the category counts

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 Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on the review of information from the data elements collected in MIS2000 Web Interface and the MEP projects data management systems (MEP Projects source data).

The COE is the primary source for data-points in the both databases. Additional data elements to populate Category 2 counts are collected by MEP projects and Maine's MIS2000 web interface. MEP Projects or Service Providers collect enrollment data, number of days present and type of provided instruction. For the 2011-12 MEP counts, MEP staff reviewed each COE record for the reporting period and cross-referenced it with MEP Projects/service providers records as well as the State student information system to ensure the students in the counts were present in Maine to determine Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts; presence was based on QAD, COE date or enrollment date during the reporting period.

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.

Eligibility Criteria:

A report was run to include all the necessary data points required to complete both parts of the CSPR. The following is a list of data fields extracted for the initial CSPR report: Student ID, Last Name, First Name, Middle Name, Sex, Birth Date, Race, Birth City, Birth State, Birth Country, Qa Date, Coe Date, Eligible, COE ID, Res Date, Currentaddress, Current City, Current State Code, Zip, Phone, Curf Name 1, Curl Name 1, Curf Name 2, Curl Name 2, Homebaseaddr, Homebase City, Homebase State Code, Homebasezip, Homebase Country Code, From City, From State Code, From Country Code, To City, To State Code, Moved reason, Seasonaltemp Flag, Work Type, Worker Name, Facility Id, Facility Name, Enroll Date, Type _, Grade, Days Enr, Days Pres, Term Type, Term Date, Withdraw Date, School Year, Counselingyn, Advocacy, Computerskills Y/N, Dental, EDSuppliesYN, EnglishLanguageArtsYN, HealthSafteyYN, MathematicsYN, Nutrition, NeedsAssess, OtherYN, Other2Name, ReadingYN, ScienceYN, SocialStudiesHistoryYN, PupilTransport, Eslllep, Specialled, Priorityforservice, Continuationofservice, Referredtootherservices, Receivedservice,

The MEP used MIS2000 to generate Category 1 and Category 2 counts for the 2011-12 CSPR reporting period. The report produced a complete list of all students eligible during the reporting period. To be eligible for migrant education services, there must be a qualifying move within 36 months of the first day of the reporting period. The first day of the reporting period for the 2011-12 report is 09/01/2011. Therefore, the 36 month window begins on 09/01/2008. The period ends on 08/31/2012. Once the date window is established, a query is generated from MIS2000 based on Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) between 09/01/2008 and 08/31/2012.

In addition, the following data elements are accessed through the State Student Information System: Dropout, GED, State Assessment, School data. LEP and IDEA data from MIS2000 are cross validated with the state student

database. Age/Grade:

Age was calculated as of 8/31/12. The initial data report selected students whose birth date was less than or equal to three on the report period end-date and those whose twenty-second birth date was greater than or equal to the start-date of the reporting period. Children under the age of 3 as of 8/31/12 were not included in either Category 1 or Category 2 counts, however individual data was collected for use in reporting for the CSPR Part II. Children who were two years old and eligible in last years' data, would be recertified base on age, and included in this years' counts if presence was established for the current reporting period.

Residence/Presence:

The initial data report filtered the following data points for a date within the reporting period: enrollment date, QAD, residence date, termination date, funding date, withdraw date, and/or COE date. Additional parameters specified that the termination date hold a value of null or greater than or equal to the start-date of the reporting period. Attendance rosters from migrant projects, COE dates between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12, as well as confirmation of an Infinite Campus (The State's Student Information System) enrollment date in a Maine school represented the primary sources to account for presence within Maine during the reporting period. Any students who were not verifiably present in the state during the reporting period were removed from the primary student list.

Data Validation:

The SEA undergoes a series of comprehensive multiple cross reference/data validation procedures. These multiple

match reports ensure accurate counts for Category 1 and Category 2.

In order to demonstrate and capture eligible children who were resident in Maine for at least 1 day during the eligibility period the SEA requested that State data staff run a match report to compare MIS2000 data with State Student Information System to verify which eligible migrant students enrolled for at least one day in Maine schools during the reporting period; as well as approved COEs within September 1, 2011 - August 31, 2012 and MEP Projects participation queries. The resultant matches are included in the Category 1 count. In addition, the SEA used the same system for Category 2, with emphasis placed in MEP Projects queries and records which reported enrollment data, (attendance) number of days present and type of provided instruction/services. Once final validation was complete, all migrant related data was sent to ED Facts for CSPR finalization.

Duplication:

The SEA's process of eliminating duplicate students within our system of records through three differentiated methods:

- 1) Prior to the inclusion of any individual student record in the system; the system alerts the SEA's approval authority or designee of potential duplicates or confirms it as a new, unique, individual student record.
- 2) MSIX email notifications alert the SEA of potential duplicate student records. As a result, data staff addresses these potential duplicates within Maine's system of record -MIS2000- as well as in MSIX portal.
- 3) In addition, the SEA reviews every individual student record for Category 1 and 2 in order ensure there are no duplicates. Then cross references are made with the individual student records provided by MEP Projects. This cross validation process enhances data quality and ensures there are no duplicate students in the category counts.

BOX 1: Are students assigned a unique identification number? Please explain how this is done so.

- Yes, 1) MIS2000 automatically assigns a generated unique ID to each Student record. It also provides search capabilities and reports to identify duplicate Student records in the system and merge functionality to merge them.
- 2) MIS2000 also associates the MSIX ID for each student with its own unique ID for students, so that effectively provides another method of having a unique ID for each Student record.
- 3) MIS2000 in ME also supports associating IDs from the ME DOE to Student records, which also provides another method of having a unique ID for each Student record.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on the review of information from MEP Projects records and queries.

The COE is the primary source for data-points in the both databases. Additional data elements to populate Category 2 counts are collected by MEP projects and Maine's Student Information System (MIS2000). MEP Projects or Service Providers collect enrollment data, number of days present and type of provided instruction.

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.

Maine's MEP hired and deployed seven additional ID&R staff during the summer. Two 15 week experienced recruiters and a University of Maine intern were hired for the entire duration of the summer in order to ensure all eligible migrants were recruited and were provided with the opportunity to access the services they were entitled to receive during Maine's busiest crops, Broccoli and Blueberry Harvests. In addition, during the Blueberry Harvest (first three weeks in August), the SEA hired an additional 3 temporary experienced Summer recruiters and an onsite ID&R coordinator through ESCORT.

The SEA ensures the proper eligibility determination and verification of each child included in the Category 1 Counts by:

- The usage of an electronic COE in order to capture and collect the great majority of data elements to populate CSPR. MIS2000 has built in quality control mechanisms to validate electronic COE data input by recruiters and alert recruiters if elements are suspect. For instance, the recruiter will not be allowed to continue or upload data until all critical data elements are filled in and valid. This is an added quality control mechanism for data validation built into Maine's MIS2000 system.

- Student eligibility is always based on a personal interview with the parent, guardian or the worker.

- The SEA conducted a Two Day Comprehensive ID&R Training led by ESCORT and Maine's State Director with the two State seasonal recruiters, which included:

- Overview of the Maine Migrant Education Program;
- Overview of qualifying agricultural and fishing industries in Maine;
- Overview of 2010 Non Regulatory Guidance and Statute.
- Overview of Maine's ID&R Manual, Protocols and Procedures.

ID&R Strategies:

Role of the Maine Project

Recruiter; Review of Maine MEP services;

Overview of typical daily recruiting schedule and routine; Review of the Maine COE and Field Script; Review of documentation and reporting procedures; and, Overview of logistics and resources.

- Maine's year round ID&R staff participated in ongoing targeted training opportunities offered by ESCORT and Maine's MEP Director.

In addition, all MEP staff participated in training sessions in regards to the Tablet System and Electronic COE which aimed to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of MEP resources and improve data quality.

The SEA continues to evaluate Maine's ID&R processes and procedures to enhance effectiveness and efficiency while maintaining high accuracy and quality.

The SEA has a formal comprehensive quality control process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information, which consists of: once a recruiter determined eligibility and entered the information it would be assigned a pending status; the ID&R coordinator reviewed the record and lastly, the Director or Approval Authority reviews the COE for verification. The data becomes visible once this approval takes place. Only at that point, the data is populated into the system of record, MIS2000. Any cases with questions, inconsistencies, or missing data would be returned to the previous reviewer for additional clarifications. The system would alert reviewers and the recruiter that the COE has been rejected. If the reviewers lack sufficient information to clarify questions or inconsistencies, the COE will be returned to the original recruiter, who may have to re-interview the family again. Therefore, every COE and unique student record completed during the 2011-12 were reviewed by the ID&R coordinator and Director, approval authority or designee. The SEA reviews all student attendance records at summer and intersession projects.

As previously noted, recruiters capture and input the eligibility data; while service providers submit data elements to the SEA via MIS2000 web interface and electronic records/hard copies from MEP Projects individual data management systems (source data).

Lastly, the State Director conducts an extensive process of cross referencing. The State Director reviews child counts from

the previous two reporting years; reviews each individual record in localized data bases/source data files from individual projects in the field and assesses reasonableness of counts as it compares data counts to other external trends such as DOL and/or Migrant Health counts.

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.

During the 2010-2011 reporting period, the SEA contracted with ESCORT in order to undergo a formal independent re-interviewing process. ESCORT used sampling methodology and guidance from OME and utilized a standard re-interview form and protocol utilizing out-of-state re-interviews and on independent review eligibility determination panel. There were 116 total available samples, 50 initial random samples, 66 non repetitive alternate samples. The random sample lists were randomly generated by MIS2000, Maine MEP system of record. Fifty re-interviews were completed. All 50 random re-interviews were found eligible.

In addition, usually during the Fall harvest, the SEA conducts random family re-interviews as a data quality control method.

Two independent re-interviewers were used during the Maine Prospective Re-interviews in 2011. Both re-interviewers

have

years of experience in determining the eligibility of migrant students. One has been a recruiter for Texas, while the other is an ID&R Coordinator. Each re-interviewer was knowledgeable on current regulations regarding the eligibility of migrant children.

Once they arrived in Maine, the two re-interviewers received state-specific training regarding the agricultural and fishing industries of Maine, as well as the migrant landscape. Training also included a review of the basic eligibility factors as well as Maine's interpretation of the eligibility requirements for MEP. The training also discussed the qualifying activities more likely to be found in the state.

Lastly, the re-interviewers received training on the re-interview process. This included: the purpose of the re-interviews, the number of interviews needed to meet the desired sample size, using the sample lists, what order to interview the family, how to conduct face-to-face interviews, and completing the re-interview form. The re-interviewers understood that local staff would help facilitate in locating the families and serve as the bridge between the families and the re-interviewers. However, local staff and re-interviewers were given guidance that local staff would not be present during the actual re-interview.

The Maine MEP contracts MS/EDd to manage the state's database for all migrant students. MS/EDd provides ME with state specific licensed software called MIS2000. The use of MIS2000 guaranteed that every migrant child in the state had the same probability of being selected for the re-interview sample. The sampling universe determined for this study was all the children in Maine determined eligible from July 1, 2010 to August 10, 2011. This range encompassed at least one full school year and included all of the children identified as migrant during the 2011 summer harvest. It was important to include a complete summer harvest since the majority of the migrant children travel to Maine for the blueberry harvest.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has a formal comprehensive quality control process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility and demographic information, which consists of: once a recruiter determines eligibility and enters the information it is assigned a pending status; the ID&R coordinator reviews the record and lastly, the Director or Approval Authority reviews the COE for verification. The data only becomes visible once this approval takes place. Only at that point, the data is populated into the system of record, MIS2000. Any cases with questions, inconsistencies, or missing data would be returned to the previous reviewer for additional clarifications. The system would alert reviewers and the recruiter that the COE has been rejected. If the reviewers lack sufficient information to clarify questions or inconsistencies, the COE will be returned to the original recruiter, who may have to re-interview the family again. Therefore, every COE and unique student record completed during the 2011-12 were reviewed by the ID&R coordinator and Director, approval authority or designee. The SEA reviews each unique student record at summer and intersession projects.

The SEA's process of eliminating duplicate students within our system of records through three differentiated methods:

- 1) Prior to the inclusion of any individual student records in the system of record; the system alerts the SEA's approval authority or designee of potential duplicates or confirms it as a new, unique, individual student record.
- 2) MSIX email notifications also alert SEA data management staff of potential duplicates. Data staff addresses these alerts in MSIX portal as well as Maine's system of record, MIS2000.
- 3) In addition, the SEA reviews every individual student record for Category 1 and 2 in order ensure there are no duplicates. Then cross references are made with the MEP projects source data. This cross validation process enhances data quality and ensures there are no duplicate students in the category counts.

The Maine MEP continues to evaluate and develop its data management procedures. For the 2011-2012 counts, the SEA applied a comprehensive multiple cross reference/data validation procedure. This procedure consisted of multiple match reports to ensure accurate counts for Category 1 and Category 2.

In order to demonstrate and capture eligible children who were resident in Maine for at least 1 day during the eligibility period, the SEA requested that State data staff run a match report to compare MIS2000 data with State Student Information System to verify which eligible migrant students enrolled for at least one day in Maine schools during the reporting period; approved COEs within September 1, 2011 - August 31, 2012 and MEP Projects participation queries. The resultant matches are included in the Category 1 count. In addition, the SEA used the same system for Category 2, with emphasis placed in MEP Projects queries and records which report enrollment data, (attendance) number of days present and type of provided instruction/services. Once final validation is complete, all migrant related data is sent to ED Facts for CSPR finalization.

.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 MEP conducts an extensive process of cross referencing the available and validated data. As a system of checks and balances, for the 2011-12 MEP counts, MEP staff reviewed each COE record for the reporting period and cross-referenced them with both MEP projects' records and queries, as well as the State student information system. This ensured eligibility and residence in Maine for at least one day to determine Category 1. Additional data elements to populate Category 2 counts are collected by MEP projects via MIS2000 Pilot Web Interface as well as their own individual data management systems (source data). This methodology revealed those served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project either the summer term or during intersession periods for Category 2.

Lastly, the State Director conducts an extensive process of cross referencing. The State Director reviews child counts from the previous two reporting years; reviews each individual record in localized data bases/source data files from individual projects in the field and assesses reasonableness of counts as it compares data counts to other external trends such as DOL and/or Migrant Health 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.

The SEA will continue to improve accuracy of MEP eligibility determination by:

- Continue to conduct comprehensive, continuous and consistent recruiter training with emphasis on lessons learned and recruiters' individual needs;
- Continue to enhance Maine's MEP Tablet system and Web Interface to improve data quality.
- Continue improvements to streamline mechanisms to capture and collect MEP data elements.

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.

N/A.