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

MISSISSIPPI

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 EDFacts 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

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
_X_Part I, 2011-12 ___Part II, 2011-12

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Mississippi Department of Education

Address:
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Debbie Murphy

Telephone: 601-359-3499

Fax: 601-359-2587

e-mail: dmurphy@mde.k12.ms.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Lynn J. House

_____ Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 3:24:46 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.

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	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	2014-15	2014-15	2011-12
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	2011-12
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	253,996	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	532	>=99
Asian	S	2,379	>=99
Black or African American	S	126,208	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	6,319	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	117,232	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	25,937	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	3,376	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	160,175	>=99
Migratory students	S	101	>=98
Male	S	129,770	>=99
Female	S	124,226	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers for Migrant students who are enrolled and take assessments vary due to the fact that many of our students have moved or are not in school at test time. Mississippi is working to verify data, given a number of coding issues identified late in the correction process.

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 (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,570	25.33
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,540	63.77
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,827	10.90
Total	25,937	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Original data run included inadvertent use of wrong variable nam for alternate assessment; variable name corrected and data routine was recalculated.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	258,016	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	532	>=99
Asian	S	2,516	>=99
Black or African American	S	127,406	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	6,358	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	119,883	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	25,976	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	3,363	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	160,964	>=99
Migratory students	S	103	>=98
Male	S	131,477	>=99
Female	S	126,539	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. MDE has added code to pick up medical exempt and non participants for RLA/English reports, which increased number enrolled (actually eligible) so that none of the categories are at 100%. Programs re-ran. The numbers for Migrant students who are enrolled and take assessments vary due to the fact that many of our students have moved or are not in school at test time. Mississippi is working to verify data, given a number of coding issues identified late in the correction process.

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.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,027	30.90
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,122	58.22
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,827	10.88
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	25,976	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Original data run included inadvertent use of wrong variable nam for alternate assessment; variable name corrected and data routine was recalculated.		

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	106,197	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	219	>=99
Asian	S	1,072	>=99
Black or African American	S	52,878	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	2,464	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	49,131	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	9,750	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	1,074	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	64,353	>=99
Migratory students	S	29	>=90
Male	S	53,632	>=99
Female	S	52,565	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Migrant data varies depending on the number of students who ar enrolled and attending school at assessment time. Additionally, some students may be gone with family or working at test time. Mississippi is working to verify data, given a number of coding issues identified late in the correction process.			

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	2,076	21.29
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	6,771	69.45
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	903	9.26
Total	9,750	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Original data run included inadvertent use of wrong variable nam for alternate assessment; variable name corrected and data routine was recalculated.		

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 <u>not</u> include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,237	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	86	S	70
Asian	355	S	90
Black or African American	18,007	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	1,153	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,324	S	77
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,451	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	894	S	67
Economically disadvantaged students	24,114	S	59
Migratory students	25	S	64
Male	19,168	S	65
Female	18,069	S	69

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These counts are correct. More students took the SATP2 Algebra & MCT2 math tests than did the SATP2 English & MCT2 RLA tests - approximately 3,800. The difference is due to double testing of 8th graders taking MCT2 and Algebra I.
Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 185, the number of grade 3 migrant students tested is 18.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,274	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	88	S	42
Asian	355	S	75
Black or African American	18,017	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	1,154	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,348	S	65
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,458	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	895	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	24,137	S	44
Migratory students	25	S	44
Male	19,191	S	49
Female	18,083	S	58

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 184, the number of grade 3 migrant students tested is 18.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,947	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	S	64
Asian	385	S	88
Black or African American	18,645	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	1,012	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,604	S	74
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,218	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	610	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	24,588	S	55
Migratory students	14	S	50
Male	19,333	S	60
Female	18,614	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 121, the number of grade 4 migrant students tested is 18.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,969	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	S	60
Asian	385	S	80
Black or African American	18,656	S	47
Hispanic or Latino	1,012	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,615	S	70
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,223	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	610	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	24,602	S	49
Migratory students	14	S	21
Male	19,341	S	53
Female	18,628	S	64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 121, the number of grade 4 migrant students tested is 18.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

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

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	38,163	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	S	60
Asian	392	S	84
Black or African American	18,868	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	1,036	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,611	S	73
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,136	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	541	S	53
Economically disadvantaged students	24,577	S	53
Migratory students	14	S	43
Male	19,728	S	60
Female	18,435	S	64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 176, the number of grade 5 migrant students tested is 11.

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	38,194	S	55
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	S	52
Asian	394	S	74
Black or African American	18,878	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	1,037	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,629	S	67
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,138	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	541	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	24,594	S	46
Migratory students	14	S	29
Male	19,738	S	50
Female	18,456	S	60

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 176, the number of grade 5 migrant students tested is 11.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,029	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	S	41
Asian	391	S	73
Black or African American	18,818	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	1,031	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,532	S	71
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,094	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	537	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	24,491	S	42
Migratory students	14	S	57
Male	19,641	S	54
Female	18,388	S	52

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 176, the number of grade 5 migrant students tested is 11.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,934	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	99	S	53
Asian	372	S	86
Black or African American	19,350	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	876	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	18,055	S	72
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,868	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	424	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	24,678	S	48
Migratory students	15	S	33
Male	19,878	S	56
Female	19,056	S	59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 129, the number of grade 6 migrant students tested is 10.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,956	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	99	S	47
Asian	371	S	79
Black or African American	19,355	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	878	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	18,071	S	69
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,869	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	424	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	24,688	S	47
Migratory students	15	S	33
Male	19,893	S	52
Female	19,063	S	62

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 129, the number of grade 6 migrant students tested is 10.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,566	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	S	84
Asian	363	S	87
Black or African American	18,560	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	870	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,526	S	74
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,471	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	364	S	54
Economically disadvantaged students	23,257	S	54
Migratory students	15	S	53
Male	19,166	S	58
Female	18,400	S	68

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 31, the number of grade 7 migrant students tested is 17.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,629	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	S	58
Asian	363	S	82
Black or African American	18,588	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	871	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	17,559	S	71
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,479	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	365	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	23,302	S	50
Migratory students	15	S	<=20
Male	19,196	S	52
Female	18,433	S	67

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 31, the number of grade 7 migrant students tested is 17.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	36,045	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	78	S	69
Asian	324	S	91
Black or African American	17,873	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	758	S	72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	16,865	S	79
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,304	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	296	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	21,714	S	59
Migratory students	13	S	62
Male	18,311	S	63
Female	17,734	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 29, the number of grade 8 migrant students tested is 9.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	36,094	S	54
American Indian or Alaska Native	79	S	58
Asian	324	S	78
Black or African American	17,896	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	759	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	16,889	S	66
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,313	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	296	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	21,748	S	44
Migratory students	13	S	31
Male	18,338	S	47
Female	17,756	S	62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 29, the number of grade 8 migrant students tested is 9.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	35,875	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	78	S	60
Asian	323	S	79
Black or African American	17,789	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	760	S	61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	16,786	S	72
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,238	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	296	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	21,595	S	45
Migratory students	11	S	27
Male	18,222	S	55
Female	17,653	S	56

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 29, the number of grade 8 migrant students tested is 9.

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	28,104	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	60	S	77
Asian	188	S	90
Black or African American	14,905	S	63
Hispanic or Latino	614	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	12,247	S	82
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,489	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	247	S	75
Economically disadvantaged students	17,247	S	65
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	14,186	S	68
Female	13,918	S	75

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These counts are correct. More students took the SATP2 Algebra & MCT2 math tests than did the SATP2 English & MCT2 RLA tests - approximately 3,800.

Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 33, the number of high school migrant students tested is 7.

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	31,900	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	S	61
Asian	324	S	80
Black or African American	16,016	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	647	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	14,772	S	72
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,496	S	12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	232	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	17,893	S	45
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	15,780	S	52
Female	16,120	S	62

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 31, the number of high school migrant students tested is 7.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,293	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	78	S	62
Asian	358	S	85
Black or African American	16,271	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	673	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	14,813	S	77
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,418	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	241	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	18,267	S	47
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	15,769	S	59
Female	16,524	S	60

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are correct. More students took SATP2 Biology & Grades 5 & 8 science than did SATP2 Algebra & MCT2 math - approximately 4,000.

Due to coding errors, migrant numbers are inflated. We are working on correcting the coding and are providing OME with an action plan to prevent future errors. Rather 34, the number of high school migrant students tested is 7.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,069	136	12.72
Districts	163	9	5.52
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	705	110	15.60
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	692	109	15.75
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	13	1	7.69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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
152	9	5.92
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	4
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	5
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	5
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Mississippi had four districts identified for Improvement in 2011-2012 school year. Each district was required to write a plan of improvement. These districts received assistance and support through venues that included the Mississippi School Symposium and the assignment of a School Support Team Member to support improvements efforts.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 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 EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) AIlocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts 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.

Schools receiving the 1003(g) grant are provided technical assistance through the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) in the form of technical assistance visits from Implementation Specialists and MDE staff, webinars, and conferences. Implementation Specialist are experts selected from applicants highly skilled as former teachers, principals, and administrators trained in developing, implementing, and monitoring school improvement. Both fiscal and programmatic evaluations are performed annually during formal monitoring visits.

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.

All Title I Schools identified for Improvement received funds from 1003(a), 1003(g), or both. Additionally, the various divisions of Mississippi Department of Education provided a multitude of technical assistance and support to districts and schools to address the achievement problems of schools identified, as well as those not 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.

Public School Choice	**# Students**
Eligible for public school choice	1,767
Applied to transfer	277
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	256
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 244,015

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	35

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

Supplemental Educational Services	**# Students**
Eligible for supplemental educational services	24,514
Applied for supplemental educational services	7,828
Received supplemental educational services	6,434
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	**Amount**
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 5,250,895
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	126,223	122,824	97.31	1,848	1.46
All elementary classes	90,591	88,743	97.96	1,848	2.04
All secondary classes	35,632	34,081	95.65	1,551	4.35

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All course /class counts are based on course codes. NCLB core area flags and instructional periods appearing on each teacher's daily schedule.

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	76.00
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	4.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	1.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	70.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	5.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	19,715	18,894	95.84
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	23,638	23,428	99.11
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	6,795	6,297	92.67
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	12,090	11,761	97.28

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	89.00	53.00
Poverty metric used		
Secondary schools	83.00	46.00
Poverty metric used		

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.

d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	7,044
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	**#**
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	5,617
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	**# LEP Students**
Spanish; Castilian	5,351
Vietnamese	355
Arabic	265
Chinese	158
Gujarati	65

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	7,043
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1
Total	7,044
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,269
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18.02
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	**#**
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,769
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1
Total	5,770
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

	#
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.	1,524

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	**Results #**	**Results %**	**Targets #**	**Targets %**
Making progress	2,392	56.35	0	61.80
Attained proficiency	1,091	18.91	0	17.80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No other assessments were offered in languages other than English.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No other assessments were offered in languages other than English.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No other assessments were offered in languages other than English.

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
6	3	9
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
S	S	N<	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
S	S	N<	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

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

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

Title III Subgrantees	**#**
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	34
////////////

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
183		11

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This data will be reviewed and amended as need during the cleanup period.

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 µLanguage 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.	71
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	108

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	28	//////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	27	//////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	22	//////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	11	//////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	25	//////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	//////////////////
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	24	1,992
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	23	231
PD provided to principals	26	252
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	18	110
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	12	349
PD provided to community based organization personnel	2	16
Total	105	2,950

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/12/11	10/07/11	89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State will start the ELL application review process according to the established time line listed below.
- All ELL applications will be received on or before June 30 annually
- Applications will be processed/approved on or before July 30 annually; thus making funds available to all eligible LEAs on or before August

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	**#**	**# LEAs Reporting Data**
LEAs without subgrants	135	135
LEAs with subgrants	17	17
Total	152	152
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	24	58
K	559	572
1	553	580
2	498	592
3	437	553
4	439	549
5	446	582
6	407	533
7	391	452
8	330	472
9	275	498
10	246	396
11	218	300
12	210	278
Ungraded		
Total	5,033	6,415
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Ungraded values were reported in the graded categories. Th will be amended when the report reopens for cleanup.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	125	189
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,580	5,906
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	272	128
Hotels/Motels	56	192
Total	5,033	6,415
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	57
K	565
1	569
2	588
3	546
4	542
5	576
6	524
7	443
8	455
9	485
10	394
11	285
12	260
Ungraded	126
Total	6,415
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	5
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,009
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Migratory children/ youth will be reviewed and admended when reporting reopens for cleanup.	

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	914	380
4	927	427
5	990	455
6	878	438
7	768	358
8	726	314
High School	487	201
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	910	505
4	927	476
5	989	543
6	876	437
7	766	395
8	724	412
High School	459	305
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	982	451
6		
7		
8	715	314
High School	474	220
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Valid score data will be reviewed for grade levels where no proficiency levels were assigned and adjusted as needed during the clean up period.		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes.*

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

a. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

b. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	89
K	51
1	48
2	43
3	29
4	25
5	13
6	16
7	19
8	16
9	19
10	8
11	9
12	4
Ungraded	4
Out-of-school	224
Total	617
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% decrease in the Category 1 Child Count as a result of several factors, they are: 1)State implemented and enforced Immigration Laws, 2)Loss of Personnel, 3)Rebuilding post Hurricane Katrina, 4)Budget cuts and 5)Inclement Weather Conditions.
1. STATE IMPLEMENTED AND ENFORECED IMMIGRATION LAWS: The new immigration law implemented in the state of Alabama and other states has played a major role in the movement of migrant families. A vast number of Mississippi families left the state due to the possibility of being deported and/or harassed by officials. Migrant students and families live in fear of the implementation of the same or similar immigration laws being passed and enforced in Mississippi.

2. LOSS OF PERSONNEL: The Northeast Recruiter relocated; therefore, there was a lack of recruitment in her area until a new recruiter was hired. The lack of recruitment may have led to fewer students/families being identified and/or being served by the center.

3. PREBUILDING POST HURRICANE KATRINA: The coastal area has experienced a decline in the number of fishermen and shrimpers because of a lack of opportunity to fish and shrimp. The coastal cities/towns are encouraging and developing the tourist industry. The local/state emphasis has been on new construction, gaming, recreational fishing and other activities since Hurricane Katrina. Migrants are making more money and finding stable employment in tourism related industries. Fishing and Shrimping are quickly becoming obsolete.

4. BUDGET CUTS: The Migrant Education Service Center's budget decreased in 2011-2012. The decrease in funding affected travel for all recruiters, statewide. Recruitment opportunities have declined in some areas because of the budget constraints.

5. INCLEMENT WEATHER CONDITIONS: Mississippi Delta farmers were impacted by flooding spring 2011. Some farmland was deemed useless due to the impact of floods in the area. April and May of 2011 were the months when the Mississippi Delta received the most damaging floods. Migrant workers had to move to other states in order to find work, since there were no crops to harvest in various parts of the Delta.

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)	43
K	41
1	29
2	26
3	9
4	14
5	10
6	9
7	9
8	13
9	9
10	6
11	5
12	0
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	52
Total	281
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% decrease in the Category 1 Child Count as a result of several factors, they are: 1)State implemented and enforced Immigration Laws, 2)Loss of Personnel, 3)Rebuilding post Hurricane Katrina, 4)Budget cuts and 5)Inclement Weather Conditions.
1. STATE IMPLEMENTED AND ENFORECED IMMIGRATION LAWS: The new immigration law implemented in the state of Alabama and other states has played a major role in the movement of migrant families. A vast number of Mississippi families left the state due to the possibility of being deported and/or harassed by officials. Migrant students and families live in fear of the implementation of the same or similar immigration laws being passed and enforced in Mississippi.

2. LOSS OF PERSONNEL: The Northeast Recruiter relocated; therefore, there was a lack of recruitment in her area until a new recruiter was hired. The lack of recruitment may have led to fewer students/families being identified and/or being served by the center.

3. PREBUILDING POST HURRICANE KATRINA: The coastal area has experienced a decline in the number of fishermen and shrimpers because of a lack of opportunity to fish and shrimp. The coastal cities/towns are encouraging and developing the tourist industry. The local/state emphasis has been on new construction, gaming, recreational fishing and other activities since Hurricane Katrina. Migrants are making more money and finding stable employment in tourism related industries. Fishing and Shrimping are quickly becoming obsolete.

4. BUDGET CUTS: The Migrant Education Service Center's budget decreased in 2011-2012. The decrease in funding affected travel for all recruiters, statewide. Recruitment opportunities have declined in some areas because of the budget constraints.

5. INCLEMENT WEATHER CONDITIONS: Mississippi Delta farmers were impacted by flooding spring 2011. Some farmland was deemed useless due to the impact of floods in the area. April and May of 2011 were the months when the Mississippi Delta received the most damaging floods. Migrant workers had to move to other states in order to find work, since there were no crops to harvest in various parts of the Delta.

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.

The SEA used MIS2000 to generate this report and child counts from the last reporting period. The SEA's category 1 and category 2 child counts were generated using the same system, MIS2000.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count data was collected using information from COEs, and school records and/or data. The data elements collected were: names, ages, dates of birth, grades, family information, and addresses. Additional information included family history of migrancy, and the kind(s) of worked performed. In order to collect the data; families, school personnel, and other stakeholders were interviewed. The data is collected upon identification and recruitment of the students and their families. After data is collected by the migrant education service center all information is input into MIS2000. The SEA/LEAs Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts are generated using MIS2000 in the same manner as previous years; the Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center uploads data 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 Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center receives funding from the SEA to provide services to children in all of Mississippi's 152 school districts. Migrant children and families are served by center personnel, contractual personnel and statewide recruiter/advocates. The service centers' data coordinator with assistance from student workers inputs all COEs and relative migrant data into MIS2000. The service center uploads data on a weekly basis to the state server. The data is uploaded to the state server which is housed at the SEA/Mississippi Department of Education. The State Director reports all migrant demographics to USDE, OME, State Board of Education, school districts and other entities as requested.The SEA in conjunction with the Migrant Education Service Center runs an Unduplicated count of Eligible Migrant students. This Unduplicated report is generated via MIS2000.

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 2 Child Count data is collected in the same manner as Category 1 Child Count.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who–in the case of Category 2–received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information for the child count is input into MIS2000 at our migrant education service center, the site inputs demographics from the COEs of those students/families that are determined to be eligible for the MEP by regional recruiters. Below are the criteria used for our Category 1 Report and Category 2 Report. Each report counts the student in the grade assigned to the most recent enrollment meeting the report criteria. The StartDate and EndDate represent the beginning and end of the reporting period, respectively.

Category 1 Report
a.. EnrollDate, FundingDate, LQMDate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between StartDate and EndDate (This verifies that the student had activity during the reporting period.)
b.. LQM3Date >= StartDate (This verifies that the student is within 3 years of their LQM at the beginning of the reporting period.)
c.. DomID = MS (This verifies that the school history line is a MS enrollment.)
d.. TwentySecondBDay >= StartDate and ThirdBDay <= EndDate (This verifies that the student is between the ages of 3 and 21 during the reporting period.)

Category 2 Report
a.. EnrollDate, FundingDate, LQMDate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between StartDate and EndDate (This verifies that the student had activity during the reporting period.)
b.. DomID = MS (This verifies that the school history line is a MS enrollment.)
c.. Type = S or Type = I (This verifies that the enrollment type is Summer or Intersession.)
d.. Twentysecondbday >= StartDate and Thirdbday <= EndDate (This verifies that the student is between the ages of 3 and 21 during the reporting period.)
e.. Twentysecondbday >= FundingDate (This verifies that the student turns 22 after their FundingDate.)
f.. LQM3Date >= StartDate (This verifies that the student is within 3 years of their LQM at the beginning of the reporting period.)

We know that students are in the state because our recruiters identify the students and complete a cetificate of eligibility on each student/family. The SEA uses the national COE, as approved by OME. We know which counts are duplicated and unduplicated, because we use the MIS2000 system and we have the capibility of running unduplicated counts when needed, as well as duplicated counts.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA's Category 1 and 2 Child Counts are generated using the same data criteria which are part of the MIS2000 system.

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.

All children are determined to be migrant and eligible for services via the Migrant Education program before information is input into MIS2000. The information that is input into MIS2000 comes from COEs that are completed on each migrant family. The SEA's COE is standard and contains the following documentation: father/mother's legal name, current male/female guardian's name, current address, all children's names, grades, birthdates, gender, birthplace, date of school enrollment, student number, school district of origin, current school district, qualifying arrival date, residency date, type of move and with whom, type of employment (seasonal/temporary), qualifying activity/employment and person verifying information, i.e., parent, guardian, etc. The COE's information is verified by trained recruiters. All COEs contain the signature of the interviewee, the interviewer/recruiter, the program coordinator (who verifies the content and eligibility of the family). If there is a question regarding eligibility the COE is forwarded to the state for a final determination. All migrant recruiters are trained and certified by the SEA, ESCORT and national ID & R experts. Recruiters attend formal trainings, workshops and conferences at least three times per year and they are required to maintain copies of ID & R guidelines/eligibility standards and the non-regulatory guidance along with other relative educational/reference material. Recruiters are required to visit schools, attend parent meetings and community activities in order to identify and recruit migrant families, they also do home visits on a regular basis. The SEA meets with service center staff and regional recruiters/personnel monthly at recruiters' meetings, coordinators meetings, technical assistance visits and monitoring/audit visits.

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 state/Mississippi has used its current re-interview defect rate and findings as a strengthening tool which has ultimately increased the quality of our ID & R process. As a result of the lessons learned from the re-interview the state has implemented the following: 1)morprofessional development opportunities for ID & R staff 2)intrastate coordination and/peer training 3) the purchase and utilization of COE tablets for recruiters 4) upgrading the current MIS2000 system and going live with MSIX. The service center under the direction of the SEA has used the final determinations of the re-interviews as a learning tool which has ultimately strengthen quality control and ID & R in Mississippi; resulting in increased recruitment and identification of Migrant students/families. The SEA is in the process of seeking a contractor to conduct an external Re- interview Spring/Summer of 2013.

The Mississippi Migrant Education Program conducted its last external re-interviews October 12 - 22, 2009. The re-interviewers had no Mississippi ties; also team members were bi-lingual and considered to be experts in ID & R. The team conducted statewide re-interviews from a random sample of more than 200 students/families. The 94 COEs reviewed represented 193 children, 94 COEs were reviewed out of a possible of 155 Sample COEs. This would represent a total of
144 migrant students. (Not children).
During the re-interviews, four COEs representing eight children were found to need more information to determine eligibility. The information the re-interviewer needed and the way in which the questions were resolved are described below:
• For one COE, two of the children on the COE had different qualifying arrival dates than the other children. The MMESC needed to provide two separate COEs due to the different dates the children moved. A new interview was conducted and two separate COEs were submitted.
• For one COE representing two children, a prior history of moves was needed. The family had COEs on file from residence in a previous site. Copies of the COE from the previous site were obtained and added to the file.
• For one COE representing two children, the "move from" on the COE did not match what the interviewee said during the re-interview. A supplemental form was completed clarifying that the family misstated the city moved from during the re- interview.
• For one COE representing two children, the qualifying activity in the re-interview did not match the activity listed on the COE. Documentation was provided showing that the original qualifying activity was correct on the COE, and the discrepancy during the re-interview was due to a change in jobs since the original interview.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA and service center personnel meet monthly to discuss, data, data input and using the MIS2000 system. Training of data personnel is conducted by MSEDD annually; also new employees are trained as a part of their orientation and on-the- job training. The service center has a full time data coordinator who constantly updates information, checks for errors and inputs COEs. She and the part-time student workers consult with the ID & R coordinator and school districts to ensure accuracy of information, via the SEAs' data system MSIS. All data personnel and state personnel have been trained on the use of MSIX, MIS2000 and the SEAs' MSIS. The SEA checks data in MIS2000 on a regular basis for accuracy and coordinates with MSEDD to ensure efficiency and accuracy of data as a part of the overall quality control process. The SEA in conjunction with outside ID & R specialists, ESCORT conducts random audits of files annually; this includes a review of COEs, student records and other relative documentation.

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.

State staff runs reports at the state level and checks the state report against information that has been input at the Migrant Education Service Center. Counts are also checked by MIS2000 personnel for accuracy and to ensure that the proper counts are documented and reported as requested by the USDE in the required format.

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.

State staff runs reports at the state level and checks the state report against information that has been input at the Migrant Education Service Center. Counts are also checked by MIS2000 personnel for accuracy and to ensure that the proper counts are documented and reported as requested by the USDE in the required format.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has no questions or concerns about the accuracy of the child counts, or underlying eligibility determinations; all information has been validated by regional and state personnel using the MIS2000 system, MSIS, COEs, parental/guardian interviews, school records and other relative documentation.