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

NEW YORK

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:
NYS Education Department

Address:
89 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12234

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Kristen DeSalvatore

Telephone: 518-474-7965

Fax: 518-474-4351

e-mail: kdesalva@mail.nysed.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Kristen DeSalvatore

_____ Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 12:38:24 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.
State has revised or change	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or “Not Applicable” to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2012-2013	2012-2013	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Please visit http://www.engageny.org/common-core-curriculum-assessments for detailed information.

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.
_____State has revised or changed	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	2012-2013	2012-2013	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Please visit http://www.engageny.org/common-core-curriculum-assessments for detailed information.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

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

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2012-2013	2012-2013	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Please visit http://www.engageny.org/common-core-curriculum-assessments for detailed information.

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)	60.00
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	40.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
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	1,409,849	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	7,171	98
Asian	S	118,562	>=99
Black or African American	S	260,125	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	316,926	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	696,251	>=99
Two or more races	S	10,814	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	229,135	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	100,216	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	746,467	>=99
Migratory students	S	884	97
Male	S	723,147	>=99
Female	S	686,702	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Three migrant students were removed from the C175 Proficiency file that were not removed from the C185 participation file that was submitted through EDFacts for inclusion in the CSPR. Correct counts are: All students (4,409,846), Hispanic or Latino (316,923), Migratory Students (881), Male (723,145), Female (686,701).

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	209,655	91.50
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	19,480	8.50
Total	229,135	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	1,397,179	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	7,097	98
Asian	S	115,680	>=99
Black or African American	S	258,296	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	310,915	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	694,420	>=99
Two or more races	S	10,771	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	227,961	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	89,778	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	736,184	>=99
Migratory students	S	837	95
Male	S	715,989	>=99
Female	S	681,190	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

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

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	9,199

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	208,432	91.38
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	19,529	8.56
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	127	0.06
Total	228,088	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference in the students with disabilities participation count between 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 is the count of students (127) taking taking the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment, per the instructions for 1.2.4		

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	398,307	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,075	96
Asian	S	33,577	>=99
Black or African American	S	72,857	96
Hispanic or Latino	S	90,570	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	196,114	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,114	98
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	66,460	95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	30,292	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	214,305	97
Migratory students	S	256	95
Male	S	204,085	97
Female	S	194,222	98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	60,581	91.15
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36	0.05
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,843	8.79
Total	66,460	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	203,104	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,114	S	53
Asian	17,417	S	81
Black or African American	36,647	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	48,858	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	96,858	S	71
Two or more races	2,210	S	61
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	32,305	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,149	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	114,798	S	50
Migratory students	155	S	34
Male	104,426	S	62
Female	98,678	S	62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	201,395	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,109	S	48
Asian	16,934	S	70
Black or African American	36,491	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	47,948	S	42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	96,709	S	66
Two or more races	2,204	S	58
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	32,235	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,475	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	113,275	S	43
Migratory students	145	S	22
Male	103,539	S	52
Female	97,856	S	60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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. NYS does not administer a state assessment in science in third grade.			

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	199,818	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,073	S	59
Asian	17,047	S	88
Black or African American	36,485	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	47,228	S	60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	96,136	S	78
Two or more races	1,849	S	68
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	33,948	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,953	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	112,165	S	60
Migratory students	157	S	45
Male	102,587	S	69
Female	97,231	S	70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	198,146	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,066	S	49
Asian	16,576	S	74
Black or African American	36,314	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	46,376	S	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	95,972	S	70
Two or more races	1,842	S	62
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	33,917	S	26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,290	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	110,724	S	47
Migratory students	150	S	30
Male	101,702	S	55
Female	96,444	S	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	198,195	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,051	S	84
Asian	16,984	S	92
Black or African American	36,016	S	78
Hispanic or Latino	46,825	S	80
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	95,477	S	93
Two or more races	1,842	S	90
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	33,486	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,820	S	61
Economically disadvantaged students	111,002	S	82
Migratory students	152	S	70
Male	101,711	S	87
Female	96,484	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	201,941	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,008	S	54
Asian	16,664	S	86
Black or African American	37,717	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	46,963	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	97,917	S	75
Two or more races	1,672	S	62
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	35,118	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,590	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	112,474	S	57
Migratory students	135	S	41
Male	103,753	S	67
Female	98,188	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	200,186	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,004	S	44
Asian	16,186	S	73
Black or African American	37,529	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	46,103	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	97,697	S	68
Two or more races	1,667	S	57
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	35,039	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,936	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	111,005	S	45
Migratory students	134	S	27
Male	102,788	S	54
Female	97,398	S	62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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			
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. NYS does not administer a state assessment in science in fifth grade.			

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	205,250	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,023	S	54
Asian	17,529	S	86
Black or African American	38,299	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	46,374	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,439	S	75
Two or more races	1,586	S	64
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	34,852	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,331	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	111,590	S	54
Migratory students	128	S	41
Male	105,815	S	64
Female	99,435	S	67
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	203,501	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,011	S	45
Asian	17,105	S	69
Black or African American	38,137	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	45,474	S	40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,189	S	68
Two or more races	1,585	S	62
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	34,831	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,712	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	110,088	S	41
Migratory students	122	S	31
Male	104,887	S	52
Female	98,614	S	61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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. NYS does not administer a state assessment in science in sixth grade.			

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	203,555	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,019	S	55
Asian	16,390	S	85
Black or African American	38,257	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	45,391	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,961	S	76
Two or more races	1,537	S	65
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	34,342	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,870	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	108,192	S	52
Migratory students	136	S	46
Male	105,222	S	64
Female	98,333	S	67
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	201,889	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,012	S	40
Asian	15,973	S	68
Black or African American	38,106	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	44,457	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,816	S	64
Two or more races	1,525	S	55
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	34,281	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,200	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	106,782	S	38
Migratory students	129	S	21
Male	104,302	S	48
Female	97,587	S	58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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. NYS does not administer a state assessment in science in seventh 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	203,662	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,050	S	52
Asian	16,699	S	84
Black or African American	38,180	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	44,855	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	101,593	S	71
Two or more races	1,285	S	62
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	34,239	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,808	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	106,130	S	50
Migratory students	107	S	32
Male	104,397	S	60
Female	99,265	S	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	202,127	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,035	S	39
Asian	16,271	S	65
Black or African American	38,075	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	44,039	S	34
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	101,427	S	63
Two or more races	1,280	S	57
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	34,250	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,148	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	104,766	S	35
Migratory students	100	S	16
Male	103,583	S	46
Female	98,544	S	56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	200,112	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,024	S	63
Asian	16,593	S	81
Black or African American	36,841	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	43,745	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,637	S	86
Two or more races	1,272	S	80
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	32,974	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,472	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	103,303	S	57
Migratory students	104	S	45
Male	102,374	S	71
Female	97,738	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	192,516	S	92
American Indian or Alaska Native	884	S	85
Asian	16,816	S	97
Black or African American	34,540	S	84
Hispanic or Latino	37,254	S	86
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	102,347	S	95
Two or more races	675	S	93
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	24,331	S	61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,515	S	76
Economically disadvantaged students	81,118	S	87
Migratory students	63	S	83
Male	96,945	S	90
Female	95,571	S	93
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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	189,935	S	93
American Indian or Alaska Native	860	S	89
Asian	16,635	S	95
Black or African American	33,644	S	89
Hispanic or Latino	36,518	S	88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	101,610	S	96
Two or more races	668	S	94
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	23,408	S	69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,017	S	63
Economically disadvantaged students	79,544	S	89
Migratory students	57	S	82
Male	95,188	S	92
Female	94,747	S	95
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been reviewed for accuracy.			

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			
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. For accountability purposes the third indicator at the secondary level is graduation rate. The science assessment is not part of the calculation and is therefore not reported through EDFacts.			

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	4,754	2,041	42.93
Districts	956		
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	1,681	727	43.25
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	499	119	23.85
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,182	608	51.44
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Of the 3,359 schools that were eligible for Title I funds in 2011-12, only 1,681 reported operatin a SWP or TAS program. 1,665 were eligible but did not report having an operational program.			

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
668		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The C103 LEA file was not submitted prior to the CSPR Part I correction period closing.		

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	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	53
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	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	27
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.

Consistent with Section 6316A(10)(C)(ii) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) legislation, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) requires school districts that are identified for corrective action to conduct an audit of their written, tested, and taught curriculum by an external evaluator. These districts are also required to prepare and provide NYSED with a district Action Plan that details how the recommended corrective actions identified through the audit will be implemented. The NYSED provides these designated districts with a protocol and template, which outlines the steps that a district must undertake in order to be in compliance with this requirement. Following is a description of the format that designated districts are required to include in their audit.

NCLB DINI CORRECTIVE ACTION
FORMAT FOR AUDIT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION AND PLAN OF
ACTION Required Components
The Audit of Curriculum and Instruction, unless otherwise approved by SED, will pertain only to the subject(s) in which the district has been identified for Corrective Action: English Language Arts and/or mathematics. In instances where a district is identified for only specific sub-populations, and achievement for all other populations is strong, the Audit of Curriculum and Instruction may focus on that specific sub-population. The report must address the grade level(s) and sub-populations for which the district failed to make Adequate Yearly progress. To the extent appropriate, the report should include all grade levels, from Kindergarten through high school and all NCLB identified subgroups, and examine the education of all district students, regardless of program placement, with particular attention to at-risk sub-populations. Additionally, the report must include an analysis of the learning environment and school culture including, policies to provide a safe, equitable and orderly learning environment. Recommendations must meet all applicable State Education Department (SED) regulations and requirements, including addressing mastery of all learning standards in the identified area(s). The auditors should meet early in the process with the district to determine what plans, documents, etc. will be reviewed, and who should be interviewed/observed. Auditors must complete class visits as part of the audit.

The report may not make recommendations that conflict with applicable State or Federal laws or regulations or with local collective bargaining agreements. The report, while it may highlight constraints beyond district control, should include recommendations that are "actionable" and "doable" in light of the realities of district fiscal constraints. The school district must be given at a minimum at least one opportunity to review and comment on The Report and recommendations before the final documents are submitted to the district and the State Education Department. The Plan of Action developed by the school district must be based on the recommendations contained in the audit and should be long term, for at least three years, with a timeline that delineates action steps across years. Implementation of the plan of action must commence by September with the start of the next school year. Unless the district receives permission from the State Education Department, the district must include in its Plan of Action a strategy to fully implement each of the recommendations contained in the auditor's report. Upon SED's approval of the district's plan of action, the district must incorporate the plan of action into the district's Consolidated Application, CDEP or DCEP, and/or partnership agreement. Failure to complete the Audit of Curriculum and Instruction process or to successfully implement the approved Plan of Action will subject the district to additional State mandated corrective actions.

New York reserved five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration, evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. The funds set-aside for these purposes were used primarily to support the salaries and related fringe benefit costs of staff who administered this large complex grant program and provided extensive technical assistance to LEAs across the state during SY 2010-12.

During SY 2010-11, New York used administrative set-asides from Title I Part A, Title II-Part A and D, and Title III funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA. In addition, New York used Title II and Title III state level set-asides to support these efforts as well as a significant amount of State General Fund dollars to oversee the approved differentiated accountability system in New York. Race to The Top funds were also used to support low performing schools via a statewide platform for professional development for all teachers, schools and districts through a Statewide Network Team structure. The Network Team structure consists of three person teams of experts in curriculum, data analysis, and instruction that serve a network of schools within their districts. In addition to providing ongoing guidance and support, the Network Teams monitor the professional development activities and results in the schools for which they are responsible.

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	53
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
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)	
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. Due to the ESEA Waiver that NYSED was granted in May, 2012, final AYP determinations have not yet been made for the 2011-12 school year, so no AYP appeals have been received or approved.		

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 1.70%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. ESEA prohibits LEAs that are receiving a decrease in their Title I, Part A allocation from contributing to the SIG 1003(a) pot. During the 2011-12 cycle, many districts have experienced a decrease in their allocation; so the amount generated for 1003(a) grants has been severely reduced.

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.

New York reserved five percent of section 1003(g) funds for administration, evaluation and technical assistance to participating districts. The funds set-aside for these purposes were used primarily to support the salaries and related fringe benefit costs of staff who administer this large complex program and provided extensive technical assistance to schools and districts across the state during the 2011-12 SY.

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.

During the 2011-12 SY the NYSED used administrative set-asides from Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A and D, and Title III funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA. NY also used Title II and Title III state level set-asides to support these efforts as well as a significant amount of State General Fund dollars to oversee the approved Differentiated Accountability system in NY.
We also used Race To The Top funds to support low performing schools by prioritizing their eligibility to apply for grants via our Systemic School Support initiative; 21st Century Community Learning Centers; Learning Technology grants, and professional development opportunities for all teachers, schools, and districts via a Statewide Network Team structure. The Network team structure consists of three person teams of experts in curriculum, data analysis, and instruction that serve a network of schools within their respective districts. In addition to providing ongoing guidance and technical assistance, the Network Teams monitor professional development activities and results in the schools assigned.

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	382,713
Applied to transfer	23
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	13
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	$ 786,296

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	87

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	84,459
Applied for supplemental educational services	24,591
Received supplemental educational services	20,838
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data does not include NYC.	

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	$ 24,588,380
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data does not include NYC.	

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	706,151	687,792	97.40	6,809	0.96
All elementary classes	359,730	352,921	98.11	6,809	1.89
All secondary classes	346,421	334,871	96.67	11,550	3.33

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.

Each common branch course is counted as 5 classes whenever a teacher reports one assignment code.

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	95.30
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	4.70
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
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)	73.10
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	26.90
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
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	102,068	98,465	96.47
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	79,428	78,985	99.44
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	52,212	47,037	90.09
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	92,470	92,120	99.62

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	83.30	25.70
Poverty metric used	free and reduced-price lunch	
Secondary schools	77.80	26.80
Poverty metric used	free and reduced-price lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

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

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish, Chinese, Haitian-Creole, French, Korean, Russian
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Chinese, Italian
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Chinese, Haitian-Creole, Korean, Bengali, Arabic, Polish, Yiddish, Urdu
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish, Chinese
No Response	Sheltered English instruction	//
No Response	Structured English immersion	//
No Response	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	//
Yes	Content-based ESL	//
Yes	Pull-out ESL	//
No Response	Other (explain in comment box below)	//

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NOTE: ESL information is reported by district program not by schools that have such programs.
NOTE: Dual Language and Transitional information is reported by school in districts that that have such programs.

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	236,514
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.	213,017
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	146,589
Chinese	23,535
Arabic	8,021
Bengali	6,404
Haitian; Haitian Creole	4,586

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	207,238
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	12,397
Total	219,635
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The count of 236,514 LEP students in 1.6.2.1 reflects a count of all LEP students enrolled at any time of the school year. The number of students tested (207,238) reflects a count of LEP students enrolled during the NYSESLAT testing period.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	33,572
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.20
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	199,754
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	13,238
Total	212,992
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These counts will change based on a revision of business rules used to extract the data. It is expected that the Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment will be reduced. Revised data will not be available prior to closing of the CSPR Part I correction period.	

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

Title III First Time Tested	**#**
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	46,357

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	129,607	84.49	136,757	64.20
Attained proficiency	32,089	16.06	27,905	13.10
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).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Russsian
Chinese
Korean
Haitian Creole
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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)
Spanish
Russian
Haitian Creole
Chinese
Korean
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
7,815	8,143	15,958
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
15,508	S	62	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
14,059	S	49	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
5,680	S	78	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

Title III Subgrantees	**#**
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	193
//	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	70
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	110
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	154
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	95
//	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	27
//	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	30
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	30
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	3

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	_______No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	______N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
19,431	19,431	77

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 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.	6,531
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,984

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	204	///////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	160	///////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	104	///////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	79	///////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	44	///////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	39	///////////////////
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	87	1,158
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	181	2,770
PD provided to principals	155	407
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	107	893
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	24	300
PD provided to community based organization personnel	16	153
Total	570	5,681

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Type of PD:
Other - Related to State regulations, compliance issues, etc.

We have 205 Title III district including 13 Consortiums. We count each consortium as one. The 13 Consortiums have around 210 district represented.

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
7/1/11	9/1/11	61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. LEAs were required to submit the NCLB Consolidated application for all Titles, including Title III, by August 31, 2011. Title III funds are not made available to subgrantees until after this date.		

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.

Utilize an electronic grant processing system. An e-grant system could reduce approval timeframe for LEA grants.

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	19
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	741	741
LEAs with subgrants	175	175
Total	916	916
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)	92	4,793
K	1,032	8,259
1	1,006	8,100
2	849	7,346
3	768	7,086
4	611	6,732
5	748	6,188
6	650	6,019
7	635	5,632
8	544	5,468
9	645	7,040
10	567	5,617
11	557	3,952
12	668	3,736
Ungraded	120	1,421
Total	9,492	87,389
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 170 file submitted 12/6/12 2:20 pm		

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	2,061	30,210
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,393	48,014
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	338	7,555
Hotels/Motels	700	1,610
Total	9,492	87,389
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 170 file submitted 12/6/12 2:20 pm		

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	417
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,992
K	4,310
1	5,060
2	4,629
3	4,421
4	4,041
5	3,782
6	3,730
7	3,506
8	3,347
9	3,881
10	2,816
11	1,886
12	1,979
Ungraded	1,325
Total	52,122
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	3,704
Migratory children/youth	108
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13,082
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	6,008
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	2,864	867
4	2,708	891
5	2,601	832
6	2,529	729
7	2,438	609
8	2,372	505
High School	1,409	1,158
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	2,933	924
4	2,778	1,142
5	2,655	1,116
6	2,578	921
7	2,494	830
8	2,430	777
High School	1,486	1,146
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	2,705	1,915
5		
6		
7		
8	2,258	852
High School	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NYS does not administer a state assessment in science in grade 3, 5, 6, or 7. The HS science assessment is not a single exam for a single HS science course or subject - students may take multiple HS science Regents examinations associated with different courses at different times in their HS career.		

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)	666
K	247
1	244
2	186
3	186
4	182
5	143
6	136
7	136
8	129
9	143
10	103
11	71
12	34
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	2,444
Total	5,058
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Kindergarten count should be 246. The count of 247 is a dat error.	

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.

n/a

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)	476
K	197
1	196
2	136
3	147
4	142
5	110
6	107
7	113
8	104
9	119
10	81
11	60
12	8
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	1,191
Total	3,193
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These numbers accurately reflect the number of migrant children served in summer programs.	

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.

n/a

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 New York State Migrant Education Program has been using the Management Information Systems-2000 (MIS-2000) since 1997. This system tabulates the Category 1 & 2 counts.

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 category one migrant child count was based solely on certificate of eligibility's(COE's)completed on migrant children that qualified and were identified in New York State between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012 by the migrant education recruiters. New York State uses the National Certificate of Eligibility template for collecting eligibility and demographic data. Recruiters go to farms, agribusinesses, neighborhoods, schools, human services agencies, local Migrant Education Outreach Programs, etc. to obtain leads on individuals and families who may be eligible for the New York State Migrant Education Program. They then locate and interview individuals and families to ascertain if they moved for qualifying temporary or seasonal qualifying agricultural/fishing activities within the past 36 months across school district lines, that the qualifying work obtained was out of economic necessity, and that they or their families are between 3 and twenty-two years of age and not high school graduates or have obtained their GED. These interviews by the recruiters are conducted in person, face-to-face. At that point the recruiter will complete a certificate of eligibility if the family/individual is eligible, obtaining the following information: name, address (current and prior), home base address, present school district, children's names, sex, date of birth, age, place of birth, present grade, last school attended, (if still in school), their native language, their race code (observed), from what school/town/state they came from/to, where in New York State they
arrived, their arrival date in New York State, if their children traveled with them joined them or on their own and on what dates, the name of the qualifying person they traveled with or to join, if they sought temporary or seasonal work in a qualifying activity and the specific activity they applied for or work at, their residency date in the current district, and their signature on the form. The recruiters have been trained to recognize all qualifying activities areas, such as but not limited to fruit and vegetable farms, dairy farms, nurseries, logging (the felling, trimming and skidding of trees/logs on site), food processing (vegetables, fruits, poultry, meat), apiaries, making sure to note specific activities done (e.g. picking and packing hydroponic tomatoes, etc.). Recruiters complete the COEs and send them to the ID/R office as well as a copy to the local MEOP (Migrant Education Outreach Program) as they are completed for the ID/R office to review and certify as eligible. Children who have been identified in a prior year and are still eligible and still reside in New York State must have their residency verified by one of 25 recruiters across New York State using sources such as the families themselves, local school personnel and regional MEOPS service records, by stamping a copy of the family's COE with a date still here, their signature, what source told them they were still here, and send that copy to the MEOP's and the Identification/Recruitment office as a validation copy. This process of verification begins each year in November and concludes the following November. The category 2 counts were done on the MIS-2000 data system utilizing the following records; COEs -- supplemental services records and summer enrollment/withdrawal dates/records. The State will determine the dates of enrollment for the summer program which cannot occur before the last day of the regular school year. For the 9/1/11-08/31/12 period the summer start date could be no earlier than 6/23/12 and no later than 8/31/12. Each of the 11 local Migrant Education Programs (MEOP) use a State approved and developed summer enrollment form which must contain the necessary state mandated instructional and support service codes for the summer period as required by the State Migrant Education Program. Each MEOP conducts an in-service to train their tutor/advocate on the correct completion of this form. When the tutor/advocate begins providing services they start documenting their activities on the student summer enrollment record forms. Forms are submitted throughout the summer period through early September. When the local MEOP data specialist receives the summer enrollment form he/she adds a new school history line for each migrant student receiving services. These enrollment lines are added as an "S" type of enrollment and have to contain the supplemental program services that were provided. If no supplemental services are listed for a "S" type of school history line, the migrant student will not count towards the category 2 count. Instructional bag drop off is not counted as a supplemental service for the summer term. The summer enrollment forms are kept in hard copy at the local level.

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 local MEOPs (eleven) data entry specialists input all information related to regular year and summer services and upload this information to the state computer server located in the State ID/R & MIS-2000 office. The MIS-2000 director monitors the MIS-2000 system weekly throughout the year. All data is checked for completeness and accuracy, and the MIS-2000 director accesses all data inputted on MIS-2000 and compiles the information necessary to obtain the category 2 count. Local sites will notify the State MIS-2000 director of possible duplicate students. Possible duplicate student reports are also conducted state wide to ensure no duplication occurs. The statewide director will merge duplicate records which can only be merged on the state server by the director. COE's completed on the MIS-2000

system are compared against COE's that arrive in the ID/R office by the MIS-2000 director to insure both accurate data entry and that the COE's appear on the State server. The State server computer is responsible for producing the Category 1 and 2 counts. Additionally, local MEOP's receive reports listing eligible migrant children from the State server to compare against their local data counts. Data specialists then insure that eligible migrant children appear on the State lists.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 numbers were also collected using MIS-2000.

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.

Through programming, our system only allows specific qualifying arrival dates, valid age ranges (3-21) as well as a child's eligibility expiration dates. Every time a child is entered on the computer system, a program checks to make sure that the child's age or grade status is eligible to be counted. If not, the computer refuses further data entry by relaying that the information is out of the range of acceptability. This also happens with eligibility expiration dates, residency dates and Qualifying Arrival Dates. Another check to insure an accurate child count is late name/first name matching. When a new Certificate of Eligibility is reviewed for eligibility, that name is then entered as a query of similar last/first names is made to ascertain if the spelling could be different (e.g. Hernandez vs. Hernandes). This activity is even more intensely engaged in when a child has made a move from another residence in the State to the current residence in New York State. If there is a close match, the date of birth, parents' names and other data are compared. If the information still continues to match somewhat closely, the recruiter is asked to revisit and determine if the person is the same. If the two separate children are the same person their records are merged to create one unique student. This insures the accuracy of the Category 1 count along with the Category 2 count. Safeguards for valid qualifying activities are taken by the Identification and Recruitment director and assistant director on each and every Certificate of Eligibility received and inputted in New York State. They both individually review each COE for completeness and validity, returning those to the recruiter when not acceptable. Every child that is entered onto the MIS-2000 database is assigned a unique student identification number. Every time a data entry specialist at any of the MEOP sites enters a child's name, they must do a query based on child's unique number, last and first name and date of birth. If a match is found, then a new number is not reated, thus ensuring only unique students are counted. If a match is not found, the child is assigned a unique number. Through programming, our system only allows specific Qualifying Arrival Dates, valid age ranges (ages 3-21) as well as child eligibility expiration dates. If a child graduates or receives their GED the expiration date is manually changed to the date of graduation or the day they receive their GED by the regional data entry specialist. This information is collected by the tutor/advocate.
Every time a child's data are entered on MIS-2000, a program checks to make sure that the child's age and grade status is eligible to be counted. If not, the program refuses further data entry as out of the range of acceptability. This also happens with eligibility expiration dates, residency dates and Qualifying Arrival Dates. Safeguards for valid qualifying activities are taken by the Identification and Recruitment Director and Assistant Director on each and every Certificate of Eligibility received and inputted in New York State. They both individually review each Certificate of Eligibility for completeness and validity, returning those deemed unacceptable to recruiters stating why those COE's were rejected. Two comparisons were added to our category 1 and 2 counts to insure that no migrant children who turned 3 during the funding period (09/01/11-08/31/12) were counted if they departed or with withdrawn from the program before they turned 3.
ThirdBDay<=DepDate or DepDate is null
ThirdBday<=WithdrawDate or WithdrawDate is null
The summer service code of 020(OSY Instructional Bag) is excluded from our category 2 child count comparisons to insure that migrant children who did not receive a face to face instructional or support service are not counted in our category 2 counts.

When a migrant student graduates or receives their high school equivalency diploma tutor/advocates and/or adolescent specialists inform the data specialists at each regional site who then update the term type field with either a G(graduation) or an H (high school equivalency). In addition the date of graduation or high school equivalency is added to the Term Date field on the MIS2000 computer system. This ensures that children who graduate or receive their high school equivalency diploma are not counted.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 numbers were also collected using MIS-2000.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Migrant Education Programs Identification and Recruitment Project is a separate and independent entity not related to local Migrant Education Outreach Programs. All recruiters in New York State are hired, trained, and monitored by the Identification and Recruitment Program not the local MEOP. This quality control measure insures objectivity and impartiality in this process. The New York State Identification and Recruitment Office reviews every COE completed in the State. If approved the date of approval is entered onto the MIS-2000 computer system. If not acceptable, it is returned to the recruiter to complete, update, correct or to invalidate. If not approved, the local site is notified not to provide service to the migrant children until further information is obtained by the ID/R office. If the COE is not approved after further investigation, no services will be provided and no enrollment lines will be entered into MIS-2000. The New York State Migrant Identification and Recruitment Program requires all newly identified migrant children/families census forms to have a parent/guardian signature. Exceptions are made, for example, for those individuals who are unable to write. This process helps assure that we receive the most accurate information possible on a child/family to determine eligibility. This combined with over 60 years of administrative identification and recruitment experience assures our MEP accuracy and efficiency in all Identification and Recruitment matters. The New York State Migrant Identification and Recruitment Office conducts one statewide and two regional trainings for recruiters. All new recruiters receive extensive Identification and Recruitment training by the Migrant Identification and Recruitment office staff and then are individually field trained by an experienced field recruiter for several weeks (2-4 weeks). The training consists of providing the Regulatory and Non-Regulatory Guidance to the new recruiter and explaining each. The Buckley Act of 1974 (privacy) is explained to them, mock ID/R interviews conducted and training done on how to fill out all documents related to eligibility (COEs, etc). Qualifying agricultural industries are described along with qualified activities deemed acceptable. The New York State ID/R training manual is reviewed and explained to new recruiters. All recruiters are regularly visited in the field by the identification/Recruitment staff (ID/R Director, Assistant Director, Veteran Recruiters) for quality control and recruiter effectiveness. A dedicated migrant recruiter statewide toll free 800 number is available to all recruiters to ask eligibility questions from the field regarding the eligibility of newly located children. E-mail access is also available along with electronic reports which list migrant children by MEOP, county and school districts. The New York State Migrant Education ID/R Program continues its recruiter skills self evaluation during 2009/10 based on the CONQIR model; a test evaluating their knowledge of various eligibility areas (e.g. "to join" issues). Based on their answers, the ID/R Director and Associate Director modify their training content to address these perceived weaknesses. The New York State migrant identification and recruitment program reviews eligibility questions and problems and responds to all recruiters via e-mail, and in writing on any and all eligibility rulings.

During on-site monitoring visits to each program site a random sample of Certificates of Eligibility (COE) are drawn from the eligible student population. COEs are reviewed for date of completion, date received by program site, withdrawal date and the date the information is entered into the MIS2000 system. In addition, a random sample of student record forms are reviewed for accuracy and completeness

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.

A core responsibility of each State Educational Agency (SEA) under the Title 1, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP), is to ensure that only those children who are eligible for the MEP are recruited, counted, and served. Prospective re-interviewing is a quality control process that provides States with valid and reliable information about the Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) process as well as identifying possible problems and how to correct them. "As part of the system of quality controls identified in Section 200.89 (d), an SEA that receives MEP funds must, on an annual basis, validate current- year child eligibility determinations through the re-interview of a randomly selected sample of children previously identified as migratory. In conducting these re-interviews, an SEA must - (i) Use, at least once every three years, one or more independent interviewers trained to conduct personal interviews and to understand and apply program eligibility requirements," (Federal Register/Vol. 73, No. 146/Tuesday, July 29, 2008/Rules and Regulations).

The New York State Migrant Education ID/R Program conducted a re-interview covering the period of 9/1/11 to 8/31/12. The process included the refining of the re-interview instruments followed by the re-interview. On site face to face re-

interviews were conducted on a random state-wide sample of 50 certificates of eligibility (COEs). Based on the New York Migrant Identification/Recruitment Program's Office experience with the 2004 retrospective re-interview of the migrant population, we knew that a 300% over sample would be needed in order to obtain a 100% response rate, therefore, the 300% over sample was run prior to conducting the re-interviews. In all cases the initial sample population was exhausted for interview purposes before the over sample populations were re-interviewed. Five trained re-interviewers conducted the interviews. The instrument used to re-interview families was developed as a result of the 1308 ConQIR Consortium Grant. The "Re- Interview Questionnaire" was field tested by 8 states for accuracy. The interviewers were given training on conducting the re-interview using the "Re-Interview Questionnaire." We assured that interviewers:

- Communicated with the families in their native language.
- Used a re-interview protocol that contains all data items used in making the original eligibility determination.
- All interviewers had a strong background in migrant identification and recruitment.
- Used non-threatening tactics to obtain information.
- Were well trained in regard to the re-interview questionnaire.
- Were assigned geographical areas in the following manner: 100% of re-interviews completed by non-resident recruiter, that is, they had never recruited in the area they re-interviewed.

After all fifty re-interviews were completed; an independent ID/R coordinator from the state of Kansas determined the fifty individuals/families re-interviewed were eligible.

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.

In New York, two statewide staff members are responsible for the quality control and management of the student count. Two annual two day statewide trainings are hosted for the 11 regional MIS-2000 data entry specialists. The following are some of the topics included in the trainings:

Proper school history enrollment by type (Academic, Summer, Residency Only);
Definition of supplemental services;
Needs assessment documentation/Priority of Service;
Possible duplicate student canned reports;
Reporting for academic and school year programs;
Designing Reports to eliminate data entry errors;
Health screen/Immunizations;
Migrant Student Information Exchange(MSIX); and,
Testing information.

In addition, at least one on-site training per data entry specialist is conducted each year. Additional training is available upon request. The New York MIS-2000 Director reviews each site individually to insure accuracy of information that is transferred to the New York State Server which serves as the statewide database. A toll free number is also available to data entry specialists for technical assistance.

In the 20010/11 school year a State specific data entry manual is continously updated by the MIS-2000 director, 3 MEOP Directors, and data entry personnel.

This manual is now available on the New York State Migrant Programs web-site. This manual contains snapshots of different screens to visually provide proper enrollment techniques. This has been well received state wide. This manual is continuously changing to keep up with the ever changing needs of migrant children along with the new Migrant Student Information Exchange(MSIX) initiative and New York State service delivery plan.

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.

One of the final processes to insure a unique student count in New York State is running reports which are generated using Soundex. Soundex reports compare similar names, and dates of birth. Other fields utilized to insure uniqueness are parents names, place of birth,current addresses and MEOP student service records. The ID/R director and the MIS-2000 director are the individuals responsible for comparing these reports. These records are merged insuring the child will only count once for the Category 1 & 2 counts. Once counts are completed they are shared and discussed with the NYS Migrant Program Manager and State Director for final approval and submission. In addition every regional MEP receives a detailed list/report of Category 1 and Category 2 for their review.

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.

Since no ineligibility cases were found as a result of New York States Migrant Education ID/R Programs prospective re-interview initiative, no corrective actions were needed or taken.

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 New York State Migrant Education program has no concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying determinations on which the counts are based.