

# **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**

**MISSOURI**



**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: MO Department of Elementary & Secondary Education		
Address: 205 Jefferson Street Jefferson City MO 65101		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Kim Oligschlaeger		
Telephone: 573-751-3543		
Fax: 573-751-9438		
e-mail: kim.oligschlaeger@dese.mo.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Kim Oligschlaeger		
		Thursday, February 28, 2013, 3:49:53 PM
_____ Signature		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Missouri has adopted the Common Core State Standards with full implementation in LEAs and assessment of the standards occurring during the 2014-2015 school year.

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

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

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

<p>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	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Missouri will implement updated achievement standards for the State's regular grades 3-8, high school, and alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards assessments in mathematics and English language arts to assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards and essential elements based on the Common Core State Standards during the 2014-2015 school year.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

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

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Missouri will implement updated assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards and essential elements based on the Common Core State Standards during the 2014-2015 school year for the State's regular grades 3-8, high school, and alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards assessments in mathematics and English language.

### 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)	10.00
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	90.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	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)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	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
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	474,496	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,122	>=99
Asian	S	8,917	>=99
Black or African American	S	78,905	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	23,065	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	768	>=99
White	S	352,754	>=99
Two or more races	S	7,906	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	62,093	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	14,252	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	237,950	>=99
Migratory students	S	215	>=98
Male	S	243,218	>=99
Female	S	231,231	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,898	28.82
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,891	61.02
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,304	10.15
Total	62,093	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

<b>Student Group</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Participating</b>
All students	S	470,469	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,125	>=99
Asian	S	8,688	98
Black or African American	S	78,273	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	22,450	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	738	97
White	S	350,384	>=99
Two or more races	S	7,757	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	62,164	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	13,515	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	235,337	>=99
Migratory students	S	202	95
Male	S	241,125	>=99
Female	S	229,300	>=99

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,650	30.00
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,310	60.02
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,204	9.98
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	62,164	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> 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	200,683	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	918	>=99
Asian	S	3,662	>=99
Black or African American	S	32,893	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	8,921	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	305	>=99
White	S	150,964	>=99
Two or more races	S	2,987	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	25,328	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	4,836	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	95,338	>=99
Migratory students	S	81	>=95
Male	S	102,332	>=99
Female	S	98,334	>=99

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

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

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,756	30.62
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,061	59.46
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,511	9.91
Total	25,328	////////////////////////////////////

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,078	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	296	S	50
Asian	1,420	S	73
Black or African American	11,101	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	3,722	S	42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	119	S	40
White	49,071	S	58
Two or more races	1,343	S	47
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,418	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,964	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	35,956	S	41
Migratory students	35	S	34
Male	34,449	S	53
Female	32,623	S	52

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,015	S	46
American Indian or Alaska Native	296	S	44
Asian	1,386	S	57
Black or African American	11,104	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	3,691	S	33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	113	S	31
White	49,079	S	52
Two or more races	1,340	S	43
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,427	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,875	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	35,928	S	34
Migratory students	34	S	21
Male	34,416	S	42
Female	32,593	S	51

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri only assesses students in Science in grades 5, 8, and 11.			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	66,804	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	302	S	47
Asian	1,333	S	75
Black or African American	11,238	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	3,578	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	118	S	32
White	48,946	S	57
Two or more races	1,281	S	47
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,486	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,626	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	35,734	S	39
Migratory students	37	S	43
Male	34,337	S	50
Female	32,459	S	52

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	66,721	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	301	S	48
Asian	1,296	S	67
Black or African American	11,229	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	3,543	S	39
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	116	S	41
White	48,947	S	59
Two or more races	1,281	S	53
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,489	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,537	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	35,690	S	40
Migratory students	34	S	38
Male	34,295	S	48
Female	32,418	S	58

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri only assesses students in Science in grades 5, 8, and 11.			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	67,504	S	55
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	S	51
Asian	1,278	S	77
Black or African American	11,254	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	3,407	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	116	S	43
White	49,973	S	61
Two or more races	1,189	S	54
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,378	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,203	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	35,255	S	42
Migratory students	29	S	17
Male	34,346	S	55
Female	33,153	S	55
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

**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	67,470	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	283	S	51
Asian	1,244	S	69
Black or African American	11,250	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	3,386	S	39
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	114	S	42
White	50,000	S	58
Two or more races	1,189	S	51
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,381	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,133	S	25
Economically disadvantaged students	35,240	S	39
Migratory students	27	S	30
Male	34,332	S	49
Female	33,134	S	56
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,484	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	283	S	52
Asian	1,279	S	65
Black or African American	11,244	S	20
Hispanic or Latino	3,408	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	117	S	39
White	49,962	S	58
Two or more races	1,186	S	52
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,368	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,205	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	35,231	S	37
Migratory students	29	S	31
Male	34,337	S	53
Female	33,142	S	49

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	68,171	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	299	S	52
Asian	1,279	S	75
Black or African American	11,588	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	3,287	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	98	S	50
White	50,529	S	62
Two or more races	1,084	S	53
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,022	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,899	S	34
Economically disadvantaged students	34,821	S	43
Migratory students	27	S	30
Male	35,200	S	55
Female	32,964	S	58
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	68,121	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	298	S	49
Asian	1,256	S	64
Black or African American	11,587	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	3,258	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	96	S	39
White	50,535	S	57
Two or more races	1,085	S	49
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,028	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,835	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	34,794	S	37
Migratory students	24	S	17
Male	35,180	S	46
Female	32,935	S	56
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri only assesses students in Science in grades 5, 8, and 11.			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,543	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	314	S	55
Asian	1,146	S	82
Black or African American	11,403	S	34
Hispanic or Latino	3,109	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	S	51
White	50,393	S	66
Two or more races	1,058	S	59
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,620	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,649	S	37
Economically disadvantaged students	33,475	S	46
Migratory students	32	S	38
Male	34,727	S	59
Female	32,807	S	62
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,509	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	315	S	57
Asian	1,126	S	72
Black or African American	11,408	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	3,086	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	S	42
White	50,398	S	62
Two or more races	1,058	S	56
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,631	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,595	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	33,454	S	42
Migratory students	31	S	29
Male	34,717	S	49
Female	32,783	S	64
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri only assesses students in Science in grades 5, 8, and 11.			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,647	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	313	S	46
Asian	1,150	S	72
Black or African American	11,435	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	3,036	S	44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	S	42
White	50,572	S	59
Two or more races	1,020	S	50
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,335	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,551	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	32,583	S	38
Migratory students	34	S	15
Male	34,792	S	52
Female	32,843	S	53
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,592	S	54
American Indian or Alaska Native	313	S	48
Asian	1,136	S	67
Black or African American	11,429	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	3,009	S	42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	107	S	39
White	50,567	S	60
Two or more races	1,020	S	54
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,333	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,504	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	32,535	S	40
Migratory students	31	S	19
Male	34,763	S	50
Female	32,818	S	58
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	67,541	S	49
American Indian or Alaska Native	313	S	42
Asian	1,151	S	61
Black or African American	11,406	S	18
Hispanic or Latino	3,031	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	110	S	27
White	50,499	S	57
Two or more races	1,019	S	49
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,305	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,548	S	16
Economically disadvantaged students	32,513	S	34
Migratory students	34	S	21
Male	34,728	S	51
Female	32,801	S	48
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	69,749	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	316	S	51
Asian	1,311	S	75
Black or African American	10,886	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	2,926	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	97	S	55
White	53,270	S	62
Two or more races	931	S	59
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,834	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,360	S	39
Economically disadvantaged students	30,126	S	43
Migratory students	21	S	38
Male	35,367	S	57
Female	34,382	S	57

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

**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	66,041	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	319	S	70
Asian	1,244	S	76
Black or African American	10,266	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	2,477	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	83	S	58
White	50,858	S	78
Two or more races	784	S	73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,875	S	37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,036	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	27,696	S	60
Migratory students	21	S	33
Male	33,422	S	70
Female	32,619	S	77

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	65,658	S	55
American Indian or Alaska Native	322	S	52
Asian	1,232	S	65
Black or African American	10,243	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	2,482	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	78	S	40
White	50,503	S	61
Two or more races	782	S	56
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,655	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,083	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	27,594	S	39
Migratory students	18	S	28
Male	33,267	S	58
Female	32,391	S	51

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the total of all students compared to the total male and female will not equal because not every student indicated their gender on the assessment.

## 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	2,408		
Districts	572		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY 2011-12.

### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,161		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	795		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	366		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY 2011-12.

### 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
561		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY 2011-12.

**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*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	112
Extension of the school year or school day	31
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	30
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	9
Replacement of the principal	12
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	33
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	35
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

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

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	14
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Takeover the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	19
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other major restructuring of school governance included: replaced or reassigned personnel relevant to school's low performance, restructuring efforts were implemented, school leadership teams were developed, literacy coaches were utilized, professional development and enhanced instructional strategies were provided, and curriculum changes.

**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.

LEAs identified for improvement are required to submit an improvement plan within 90 days of receiving the preliminary AYP data from the SEA. The SEA provides the web-based planning application that includes all of the requirements of the improvement plan. The SEA's Federal Instructional Improvement staff and other SEA staff are available for technical assistance during the planning process. Federal Instructional Improvement supervisors approve the plans.

LEAs identified for corrective action update their improvement plans which must be approved by SEA Federal Instructional Improvement staff. The LEAs Title I administrative funds may be withheld unless the Federal Instructional Improvement staff determines that there is fidelity to the implementation of the improvement plan and progress is being made toward improving in the areas that caused the LEA to receive the sanctions.

**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*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	134
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	14
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	15
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	48
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	1
Restructured the district	9
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	10/15/12
---	----------

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

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

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During SY 2011-2012, the SEA used 1003(g) fund for direct technical assistance to schools that were recipients of the grant award as well as evaluation of progress made toward achieving the goals outlined in their plan. The SEA utilizes a state coordinator, state resource consultant, project specialists, regional resource consultants and classroom monitors to provide support, monitoring and evaluation to schools identified as persistently lowest performing. In addition, the SEA is utilizing the resources of the Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs), Federal Instruction Improvement Supervisors and Area Supervisors to provide on-going support during the planning and implementation of the school improvement plan.

**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.

Missouri does not allocate other funds to support schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

### 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.

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	34,831
Applied to transfer	890
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	887
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,961,878

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	159,379
Applied for supplemental educational services	11,130
Received supplemental educational services	10,930
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 17,467,769
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	234,743	226,456	96.47	8,287	3.53
All elementary classes	72,429	70,103	96.79	2,326	3.21
All secondary classes	162,314	156,353	96.33	5,961	3.67

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

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

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

Missouri implemented an automated HQT system for the 2011-2012 school year. This system has enabled Missouri to better evaluate certification and content expertise in core content courses. In addition, with the implementation of the automated HQT system Missouri has identified summer school courses as core content courses. The new automated HQT system allows LEAs to run a report of their core content courses (and all course assignments). LEAs are now able to view certification and HQT status for their educators real time. This has enabled LEAs to better report course assignments for their educators.
--

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.

Missouri counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

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

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

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

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

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

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
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	15.00
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	19.40
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	65.60
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Missouri implemented an automated HQT system for the 2011-2012 school year. This system has enabled Missouri to better evaluate certification and content expertise in core content courses. In addition, with the implementation of the automated HQT system Missouri has identified summer school courses as core content courses. The new automated HQT system allows LEAs to run a report of their core content courses (and all course assignments). LEAs are now able to view certification and HQT status for their educators real time. This has enabled LEAs to better report course assignments for their educators.

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)	13.20
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	13.60
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	73.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Missouri implemented an automated HQT system for the 2011-2012 school year. This system has enabled Missouri to better evaluate certification and content expertise in core content courses. In addition, with the implementation of the automated HQT system Missouri has identified summer school courses as core content courses. The new automated HQT system allows LEAs to run a report of their core content courses (and all course assignments). LEAs are now able to view certification and HQT status for their educators real time. This has enabled LEAs to better report course assignments for their educators.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	26,327	24,494	93.04
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	46,931	46,386	98.84
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	17,447	15,622	89.54
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	42,614	41,965	98.48

#### 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	71.60	41.50
Poverty metric used	Missouri used the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program in this calculation.	
Secondary schools	60.80	36.80
Poverty metric used	Missouri used the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program in this calculation.	

**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](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"/> No	Dual language	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Below are other Language Instruction Educational Programs reported:

**Team-Teaching** - In schools where the classroom and instructional approach permit, team-teaching may be a useful way to "mainstream" LEP students and avoid frequent pull-out sessions. This technique may work especially well at the secondary level when the ESOL teacher can also teach the subject matter. Team-teaching incorporates collaboration, joint planning and cross-curricular themes into instructional programs.

**Resource Classrooms** - For various reasons (number of staff, physical facilities, etc.), some school districts have found that strategically placing an ESOL Resource Classroom in a school facilitates student progress. These rooms are probably most effective at middle and high school grades, where students take separate content classes. They can also serve as an actual ESOL classroom for part of the day. At other times, students may drop in to discuss readings, complete tests, work on projects, or do individualized units of coursework.

**Newcomer Centers** - Larger school districts and those with a steady influx of students new to both school and the U.S. have had success with newcomer centers. Depending on need and district resources, a center may serve as a kind of "chamber of commerce" for the school and community. Centers provide a safe and supportive context for students before they move into a regular school. Some districts bring all new students to a single site for assessment and initial English instruction, and may keep them there from six months to a year. Additional classes may be offered that help students adjust culturally, socially and academically.

**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	24,891
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

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.	20,963
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	13,134
Bosnian	1,096
Vietnamese	1,065
Arabic	986
Somali	754

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	23,398
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	143
Total	23,541
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri Department of Education contacted LEAs in determining why LEP students were not tested. Many districts indicated that the students withdrew from the district, students exited LEP, were absent during the testing window, and LEAs indicated students were coded incorrectly. LEAs submitted a corrective action plan to address incorrect coding.	

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

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	3,939
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.73
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	20,840
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	123
Total	20,963
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>	<b>#</b>
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.	5,818

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

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

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	10,462	69.64	11,795	69.40
Attained proficiency	3,452	16.56	4,308	18.10
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<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
<b>Comments:</b> 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)
na
<b>Comments:</b> 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)
na
<b>Comments:</b> 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)
na
<b>Comments:</b> 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
1,953	1,531	3,484

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

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,097	S	61	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
2,180	S	58	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
834	S	42	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>	<b>#</b>
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	73
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	17
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	73
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	53
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	25
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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)	7
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	56
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	45

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. Missouri has no districts that choose to be consortia members.

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

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

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

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

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

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
5,081	2,702	26

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.	444
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	767

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	75	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	74	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	75	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	65	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	65	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	21	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	72	8,451
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	74	1,240
PD provided to principals	60	566
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	53	350
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	55	924
PD provided to community based organization personnel	24	816
Total	338	12,347

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title III LEAs listed various other professional development activities.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/01/11	0
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

A preliminary Title III allocation went on-line to sub grantees on 6/13/2011. LEAs were able to submit their Title III applications by 7/1/2011.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

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

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

<b>LEAs</b>	<b>#</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting Data</b>
LEAs without subgrants	551	551
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	561	561
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	220	270
K	1,307	971
1	1,252	866
2	1,228	843
3	1,156	813
4	1,115	820
5	1,033	778
6	987	798
7	939	742
8	934	687
9	942	814
10	866	628
11	964	537
12	1,432	607
Ungraded	0	0
Total	14,375	10,174
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri does not have any students who are considered ungraded.		

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

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

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,301	1,549
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	11,503	7,764
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	313	518
Hotels/Motels	1,258	343
Total	14,375	10,174
<b>Comments:</b> 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)	246
K	816
1	649
2	634
3	604
4	594
5	553
6	543
7	482
8	451
9	582
10	433
11	399
12	491
Ungraded	0
Total	7,477
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri does not have any students who are considered ungraded.	

### 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	600
Migratory children/youth	8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,256
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	254
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,087	274
4	1,104	318
5	1,018	304
6	1,058	277
7	960	304
8	939	240
High School	790	424

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

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,092	332
4	1,106	284
5	1,017	316
6	1,062	319
7	959	311
8	937	228
High School	815	268

**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	1,020	254
6		
7		
8	934	188
High School	802	246

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri only assesses students in Science in grades 5, 8, and 11.

## 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	101
K	80
1	69
2	76
3	61
4	72
5	59
6	71
7	61
8	59
9	62
10	55
11	42
12	41
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	13
Total	922
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri does not have any students who were considered ungraded.	

**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.

After a completion of an attrition study, it was determined that any new migrant families that came to Missouri to work at some of our largest pork and poultry processing plants would no longer qualify as making temporary moves without making a worker's statement. This caused a larger number of students who previously would have been eligible to no longer be eligible.

**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)	
K	6
1	7
2	4
3	1
4	4
5	1
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	23

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Missouri did not have any age 3 through 5 (not kindergarten), grade 6, grade 7, grade 8, grade 9, grade 10, grade 11, grade 12, ungraded, or out-of-school migrant students attend the migrant summer school.

**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.

Not applicable.

### 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.

Missouri uses MSSQL 2008 Database Server to compile and generate the total number of students for Category 1. The category 2 count is collected through a manual paper system. The same systems were used in 08-09, 09-10, 10-11, and 11-12.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 counts were collected from approved certificates of eligibility (COE). Missouri's COE contain the following data elements: school district name, school district county/district code, school year, enrollment date, child's name, gender, birth date, birth place, type of verification of birth date, grade, school building code, enrollment type, parents' names and contact information, name of person that provided data, residency date, qualifying arrival date, previous residence (city, state, country), current residence (city, state, country), reason for children's move, type of move (e.g., obtain or to seek the following: temporary or seasonal employment or agricultural related or fishing related) and qualifying activity. Our COE is based on the national COE. Under Section II, the box titled "MB" is for Multiple Birth. Comments are requested in Section IV - COMMENTS.

The COE is signed by the recruiter and parent. It is then checked and signed by the state migrant director. Regional migrant recruiters find and interview families by regularly contacting agri-businesses in their regions, communicating with school district personnel, and visiting the workers in the field. Recruiters will then complete the COE and send it to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - MELL Office. Once the COE has been received, it is screened for accuracy by the Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment or the State Migrant Director for final approval.

If questions or concerns arise, the COE is returned to the recruiter for follow-up interviews or clarification. Once the COE arrives in the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - MELL Office, it will be approved and entered into the database within approximately one week from the date of receipt. Missouri's COE was developed using the example COE found in the Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children Non-Regulatory Guidance.

The category 2 count is collected and maintained through a manual paper system. It was collected directly from the Migrant Education summer school funded program. This information is then verified to ensure that the child has a COE using the Category 1 database.

The "Migrant Summer School Paper Form" is simply a list of students eligible to participate in a Migrant-funded summer school project. These students each have a completed COE. The required information on the form is the name of the student. State-funded Migrant recruiters complete the COEs and the summer school administrator submit the names to the SEA.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count data is entered by the Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment. This information is collected from the Certificate of Eligibility. If the child's information needs to be updated, the Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment will compare the information to the Certificate of Eligibility to ensure the child is the same child and will discuss the update with the area recruiter as needed. The information is updated in the database (including notations in the comment section) indicating the reason for the modification. The information is organized in the student information system alphabetically but can be sorted in any order that is necessary.

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 is collected and maintained through a manual paper system. It was collected directly from the Migrant Education Summer School funded program. A list of migrant students were sent to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - MELL Office for verification. A Migrant Summer School paper form is completed with all of the required information, including a list of migrant students that were served during summer school. The list of names is verified to ensure that the child has a COE using the Category 1 database. The "Migrant Summer School Paper Form" is simply a list of students eligible to participate in a Migrant-funded summer school project. These students each have a

completed COE. The required information on the form is the name of the student. State-funded Migrant recruiters complete the COEs and the summer school administrators submit the names to the SEA.

### 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.

Each Category 1 child count was calculated by their age and grade using the MSSQL 2008 Database Server. The Category 1 child count data was entered into the MSSQL 2008 Database Server from each child's Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE's were verified by the recruiter, supervisor of identification and recruitment, and state migrant director.

Missouri queried the migrant database to ensure that the children counted were eligible, between the ages of 3-21, resided in the state at least one day during the reporting period, and were only counted once. Missouri accounted for those children who were two years old in the previous reporting period by entering all COEs in the migrant database regardless of age and when the query was run for the current reporting period it would have included those children.

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 is collected and maintained through a manual paper system. It was collected directly from the Migrant Education Summer School funded program. A list of migrant students were sent to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - MELL Office for verification. They completed a Migrant Summer School paper form with all of the required information, including a list of migrant students that were served during summer school. The list of names was then verified to ensure that the child has a COE using the Category 1 database.

Summer School information is only collected during the duration of the summer school. Our state has one MEP-funded program and no students can participate until they have a COE approved by the State Director.

#### 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.

New migrant recruiters receive training from either the State Migrant Director or the State Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment on the Identification and Recruitment handbook and how to properly identify migrant children. They are then assigned a veteran recruiter to mentor them in the field until they are comfortable enough to go out on their own. Each school district is required by the SEA to fill out a parent survey form on each child that registers. Completed forms must be forwarded to the Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment in a timely manner, who will forward them to the recruiter. From the questions on this form the Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment can determine whether this family can be considered for the Migrant Education Program. The recruiter will then make contact with the family by phone or a visit and either set a time for an interview or, if possible, conduct an on-the-spot interview if the family is at home. The recruiter determines migrant status through a series of questions. If they are believed to be eligible for the Migrant Education Program the recruiter will enroll the qualified family on a National Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The original COE is then sent to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - MELL Office. Upon arrival the COE is date stamped, at this time the Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment reviews the COE for accuracy, the child must first meet the definition of a migrant child and all the federal regulations. All of the boxes on the COE must be completed. If the COE meets all the necessary criteria it is signed by the State Director as accurate. If an item needs clarification the original recruiter who conducted the interview is contacted to clarify the issue. If critical information is missing the COE will be returned to the recruiter to correct or complete a new COE and entered into a log as returned. It is expected back into the central office within 7 days of receipt at the recruiter's office.

Then the Supervisor of Migrant Identification and Recruitment will look the children up in the Missouri Migrant data system and MSIX to see if the children previously existed in either system. If the children previously existed in the Missouri system the existing COE is pulled and attached to the new COE, and the State ID number is noted on the new COE, if the children existed in MSIX the MSIX number is noted on the COE. If there is a conflict with the new COE and previous information on a past COE the recruiter is contacted to clarify the information. Once the COE is correct it is entered into the Missouri Migrant data system, the original copy stays at the Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education - MELL Office, the yellow copy is sent to the recruiter, the pink copy is sent to the school district and the gold copy is sent to the family. Identification and Recruitment is monitored and evaluated through the re-interview process.

The Local Educational Agencies (LEA) do not make eligibility determinations in Missouri. LEAs are required to ask questions during the enrollment process that, if answered in the affirmative, triggers further action to contact the State Director of Migrant Education. The LEAs are also required to have written procedures in place requiring that a migrant identification process is in place and that process must include notification of the State Director. The required questions on the enrollment forms and the written procedures are verified during the federal programs monitoring process.

Since the Supervisor of Migrant Identification & Recruitment (Identification & Recruitment Coordinator) is the person that does the data entry training is done on an as needed basis when changes are made to the database.

Recruiters are annually provided inservice on: The Migrant Education Program, The Role of Recruitment, How to Fill Out a Certificate of Eligibility (COE), Effective Recruitment Techniques, and Records Maintenance/Documentation.

In addition, new recruiters are shadowed by an experienced recruiter. Recruiters hired after August, 2007, are required to pass certification quizzes on each aspect of the recruitment function and 8 hours of training provided by the Missouri Migrant Education and English Language Learning (MELL) Director. Multiple opportunities are provided to review information and retake quizzes as necessary.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - MELL Office and regional recruiters determine the accuracy of recruitment by conducting a quarterly random sample of families by telephone. During the months of February, May, August, and November, 30 COE's are randomly selected from the previous two months. A recruiter that was not involved in the initial certification follows up on the COE's by telephone or in person, when necessary, to validate

the information on the original COE. The recruiter must complete 10 interviews out of this sample and report the results to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - MELL Office within 60 days of receiving the COE's. Any discrepancies are resolved with all staff involved. Adjustments are made and records of each re-interview are kept on file. Children who are found ineligible are removed from the MEP. The LEA is immediately notified that the child is no longer eligible for the MEP. Recruiters and the central office work with LEA's to maintain ongoing communication with migrant families and to notify families of students deemed ineligible for the MEP.

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and Loma Linda Consultants met the criteria of the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing. During April 8 to April 14, 2012, 140 students were sampled and 103 were determined to be eligible. The remaining children and families could not be reached. Of the children whose families were found and interviewed, none were found to be ineligible. The re-interviews focused on six Identification & Recruitment regions in the state and were representative of the state's highest impacted areas of migratory families. A team of interviewers were responsible for re-interview sessions with families and review of each COE. A review panel verified each eligibility determination for which an interview was made. Since no discrepancies or errors were found by the review panel there was no need to establish a defect rate at this time.

In November 2012, 26 COE's from the previous two months were selected results are still pending at this time.

With the assistance of the Missouri MEP, Loma Linda Consultants performed the below listed steps. Throughout the process, both partners worked together in order to have all information in place, including well trained staff, and all elements from the Office of Migrant Education's (OME) Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing. A well-qualified re-interviewing team complemented the effort by conducting the interviews and verifying information.

- Sampling
- Re-interviewing Protocol and Forms
- Interview Selection and Training
- Identifying and Interviewing Families Statewide
- Validating Forms
- Appeals Process and Challenge of Eligibility Determinations Sampling

Loma Linda Consultants secured from the Missouri MEP database a sample migrant students residing in the state of Missouri. The intent was to find a sample of children who were currently eligible for the MEP at the time the re-interview was conducted. The sampling universe included migrant students identified on a Missouri MEP Certificate of Eligibility (COE) between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012, ages 3-21. The purpose of the sample was to meet the requirement for conducting independent prospective re-interview, once every three years. The requirements for independent prospective re-interviewing are that the re-interviewers be independent of the original re-interviewers and that the prospective re-interviews conform to OME's regulatory guidance.

The size of the sample for the re-interview process was 140 students. The reason for the large number of students was to address potential non-response as families were beginning to migrate to and from the state of Missouri. The state of Missouri is a home base state as well as a sending state for many migrant families. The Missouri MEP felt the sample was adequate to perform this statewide task. The COEs for each of these students were identified and separated by region, and printed by the State MEP office to insure that regional recruiters did not have the list of identified families before the re-interviewing process began. Each COE was put in a secure envelope and was not to be opened until after the interview with the family/interviewee was conducted.

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.

COEs are reviewed by a minimum of two people who check for completion and accuracy. The COEs are standard forms and are used statewide in Missouri. The information gathered on the COE is based upon interviews conducted by the recruiters. All students are manually checked for duplication. The database is searched by student name and date of birth. If any of this data appears to be duplicated, the child is counted only once. The information in question is subsequently researched and verified and appropriate adjustments are made.

Staff then verifies that the data are inputted correctly. After a COE has been put into the database, the information is verified by the state director that there were no errors made during the data input stage.

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.

At the beginning of each school year recertification is done to verify the location of each active migrant student. For school year 2011-2012 a list of eligible category 1 migrant students from our migrant database was cross checked to that of our student information system and an encrypted email was sent to each LEA to verify the location of each active student. Category 2 students are verified to ensure the child has an eligible COE by using our Category 1 database.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As suggested by the consultant who conducted our prospective re-interview we have re-visited the current policy on temporary agricultural work, we are in the process of revisiting meat and poultry plants where migrant families work but the jobs were deemed permanent to see if they can now be deemed temporary. We are continuing to review policies and procedures in the States Identification and Recruitment policy manual with the recruiters and are continuing to provide identification and recruitment trainings.

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