

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**

SOUTH CAROLINA



**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 |
| <p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p> | |
| Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12 | |
| Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: South Carolina Department of Education | |
| Address: 1429 Senate Street Columbia, SC 29201 | |
| Person to contact about this report: | |
| Name: Bobby Rykard | |
| Telephone: 803-734-8110 | |
| Fax: 803-734-3290 | |
| e-mail: rrykard@ed.sc.gov | |
| Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Mick Zais | |
| _____ Signature | _____ Thursday, March 7, 2013, 4:41:16 PM |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

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

| | Mathematics | Reading/Language Arts | Science |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Academic Content Standards | 2014-15 | 2014-15 | N/A |

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

The state is in the process of reviewing and revising the South Carolina Academic Standards for Science 2005. Anticipated date for submission to the State Board of Education for approval is scheduled for August 2013.

The state will fully implement the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics during the 2014-15 school year. These standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in July, 2010.

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

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

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

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

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

| Academic Achievement Standards for | Mathematics | Reading/Language Arts | Science |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8 | 2014-15 | 2014-15 | N/A |
| Regular Assessments in High School | 2014-15 | 2014-15 | N/A |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 2014-15 | 2014-15 | N/A |

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

The state is in the process of reviewing and revising the South Carolina Academic Standards for Science 2005. Anticipated date for submission to the State Board of Education for approval is scheduled for August 2013.

The state will fully implement the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics during the 2014-15 school year. These standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in July, 2010.

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 GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area. |

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

| Academic Assessments | Mathematics | Reading/Language Arts | Science |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8 | 2014-15 | 2014-15 | N/A |
| Regular Assessments in High School | 2014-15 | 2014-15 | N/A |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 2014-15 | 2014-15 | N/A |

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

The State has adopted the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium's assessments. These assessments are to be administered beginning in 2014-15.

Peer reviewers have completed their review of South Carolina's science tests and alternate tests in English language arts, mathematics, and science. The United States Department of Education has not sent a formal letter of approval.

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) | 0.00 |
| 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 | 100.00 |
| 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 | No |
| Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments | No |
| Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments | No |
| Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time | 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 States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | S | 379,346 | >=99 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | S | 1,053 | >=99 |
| Asian | S | 5,172 | >=99 |
| Black or African American | S | 133,574 | >=99 |
| Hispanic or Latino | S | 23,474 | >=99 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | S | 447 | >=99 |
| White | S | 205,533 | >=99 |
| Two or more races | S | 10,087 | >=99 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | S | 49,260 | >=99 |
| Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students | S | 19,178 | >=99 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | S | 220,688 | >=99 |
| Migratory students | S | 115 | >=98 |
| Male | S | 194,098 | >=99 |
| Female | S | 185,248 | >=99 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | | | |

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|--|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 12,849 | 26.08 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 33,206 | 67.41 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 3,205 | 6.51 |
| Total | 49,260 | //////////////////// |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessments left blank are not applicable. | | |

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 | 378,901 | >=99 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | S | 1,050 | >=99 |
| Asian | S | 5,092 | 98 |
| Black or African American | S | 133,455 | >=99 |
| Hispanic or Latino | S | 23,338 | >=99 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | S | 443 | 98 |
| White | S | 205,434 | >=99 |
| Two or more races | S | 10,083 | >=99 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | S | 49,052 | >=99 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | S | 18,910 | 98 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | S | 220,388 | >=99 |
| Migratory students | S | 113 | >=98 |
| Male | S | 193,829 | >=99 |
| Female | S | 185,072 | >=99 |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|--|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 13,748 | 28.03 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 32,082 | 65.40 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 3,222 | 6.57 |
| LEP < 12 months, took ELP | | |
| Total | 49,052 | //////////////////// |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessments left blank are not applicable. | | |

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 | 274,972 | >=99 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | S | 802 | >=99 |
| Asian | S | 3,799 | >=99 |
| Black or African American | S | 95,849 | >=99 |
| Hispanic or Latino | S | 16,774 | >=99 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | S | 337 | >=99 |
| White | S | 150,284 | >=99 |
| Two or more races | S | 7,114 | >=99 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | S | 34,548 | >=99 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | S | 13,616 | >=99 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | S | 157,718 | >=99 |
| Migratory students | S | 82 | >=95 |
| Male | S | 140,775 | >=99 |
| Female | S | 134,197 | >=99 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | | | |

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|--|---|--|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 13,440 | 38.90 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 18,786 | 54.38 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 2,322 | 6.72 |
| Total | 34,548 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessments left blank are not applicable. | | |

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 | 53,818 | S | 73 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 129 | S | 74 |
| Asian | 797 | S | 88 |
| Black or African American | 18,397 | S | 57 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4,051 | S | 68 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 49 | S | 80 |
| White | 28,680 | S | 83 |
| Two or more races | 1,709 | S | 75 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,593 | S | 42 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,779 | S | 68 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 32,673 | S | 63 |
| Migratory students | 23 | S | 43 |
| Male | 27,612 | S | 72 |
| Female | 26,206 | S | 74 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |

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 | 53,634 | S | 81 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 129 | S | 77 |
| Asian | 777 | S | 90 |
| Black or African American | 18,332 | S | 69 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4,015 | S | 74 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 49 | S | 86 |
| White | 28,621 | S | 88 |
| Two or more races | 1,705 | S | 83 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,468 | S | 47 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,719 | S | 73 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 32,537 | S | 73 |
| Migratory students | 22 | S | 55 |
| Male | 27,501 | S | 77 |
| Female | 26,133 | S | 84 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |

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 | 27,124 | S | 61 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 72 | S | 67 |
| Asian | 408 | S | 77 |
| Black or African American | 9,189 | S | 40 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,082 | S | 50 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 23 | S | 65 |
| White | 14,503 | S | 76 |
| Two or more races | 843 | S | 64 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 3,900 | S | 38 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,928 | S | 51 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 16,459 | S | 49 |
| Migratory students | 17 | S | 35 |
| Male | 13,890 | S | 61 |
| Female | 13,234 | S | 61 |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students are not tested for every elementary grade in Science. Other than grades 4 and 7 where all students are tested, students are selected randomly to take either Science or Social Studies.

S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels.

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 | 54,206 | S | 79 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 130 | S | 75 |
| Asian | 780 | S | 92 |
| Black or African American | 18,798 | S | 64 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,885 | S | 76 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 67 | S | 75 |
| White | 28,846 | S | 88 |
| Two or more races | 1,700 | S | 82 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,404 | S | 44 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,591 | S | 76 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 32,984 | S | 71 |
| Migratory students | 23 | S | 74 |
| Male | 27,857 | S | 78 |
| Female | 26,349 | S | 79 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 54,028 | S | 78 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 129 | S | 71 |
| Asian | 769 | S | 91 |
| Black or African American | 18,724 | S | 65 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,848 | S | 71 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 66 | S | 79 |
| White | 28,795 | S | 87 |
| Two or more races | 1,697 | S | 82 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,291 | S | 41 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,527 | S | 70 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 32,854 | S | 70 |
| Migratory students | 22 | S | 68 |
| Male | 27,750 | S | 75 |
| Female | 26,278 | S | 82 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 54,127 | S | 74 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 130 | S | 70 |
| Asian | 778 | S | 88 |
| Black or African American | 18,765 | S | 57 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,881 | S | 69 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 67 | S | 81 |
| White | 28,807 | S | 85 |
| Two or more races | 1,699 | S | 77 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,331 | S | 44 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,587 | S | 67 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 32,924 | S | 65 |
| Migratory students | 23 | S | 52 |
| Male | 27,804 | S | 74 |
| Female | 26,323 | S | 74 |
| <p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels.</p> <p>Data has been verified.</p> | | | |

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 | 55,810 | S | 76 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 153 | S | 71 |
| Asian | 777 | S | 91 |
| Black or African American | 19,738 | S | 63 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,641 | S | 73 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 68 | S | 84 |
| White | 29,786 | S | 85 |
| Two or more races | 1,647 | S | 79 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,599 | S | 38 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,164 | S | 73 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 33,819 | S | 68 |
| Migratory students | 22 | S | 64 |
| Male | 28,517 | S | 75 |
| Female | 27,293 | S | 78 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |

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 | 55,784 | S | 77 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 153 | S | 76 |
| Asian | 767 | S | 89 |
| Black or African American | 19,743 | S | 63 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,625 | S | 71 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 67 | S | 81 |
| White | 29,782 | S | 86 |
| Two or more races | 1,647 | S | 81 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,609 | S | 43 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,129 | S | 68 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 33,808 | S | 68 |
| Migratory students | 22 | S | 64 |
| Male | 28,501 | S | 74 |
| Female | 27,283 | S | 80 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |

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 | 28,000 | S | 72 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 80 | S | 69 |
| Asian | 395 | S | 88 |
| Black or African American | 9,869 | S | 55 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,796 | S | 65 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 39 | S | 82 |
| White | 15,005 | S | 83 |
| Two or more races | 816 | S | 75 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 3,805 | S | 40 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,589 | S | 64 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 16,978 | S | 62 |
| Migratory students | 12 | S | 50 |
| Male | 14,375 | S | 71 |
| Female | 13,625 | S | 72 |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been verified.

S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels.

All students are not tested for every elementary grade in Science. Other than grades 4 and 7 where all students are tested, students are selected randomly to take either Science or Social Studies.

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 | 56,148 | S | 74 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 167 | S | 74 |
| Asian | 774 | S | 92 |
| Black or African American | 20,171 | S | 60 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,408 | S | 72 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 65 | S | 85 |
| White | 29,969 | S | 83 |
| Two or more races | 1,594 | S | 76 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,229 | S | 33 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,607 | S | 68 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 33,424 | S | 65 |
| Migratory students | 14 | S | 43 |
| Male | 28,675 | S | 71 |
| Female | 27,473 | S | 77 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 56,107 | S | 70 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 167 | S | 69 |
| Asian | 763 | S | 87 |
| Black or African American | 20,172 | S | 53 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,386 | S | 64 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 64 | S | 75 |
| White | 29,960 | S | 81 |
| Two or more races | 1,595 | S | 75 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,228 | S | 31 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,566 | S | 55 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 33,399 | S | 59 |
| Migratory students | 14 | S | 43 |
| Male | 28,655 | S | 66 |
| Female | 27,452 | S | 74 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 28,216 | S | 66 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 89 | S | 67 |
| Asian | 379 | S | 85 |
| Black or African American | 10,125 | S | 47 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,749 | S | 61 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 32 | S | 75 |
| White | 15,043 | S | 79 |
| Two or more races | 799 | S | 72 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 3,656 | S | 30 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,328 | S | 53 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 16,868 | S | 55 |
| Migratory students | S | S | N< |
| Male | 14,519 | S | 66 |
| Female | 13,697 | S | 67 |
| <p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels.</p> <p>All students are not tested for every elementary grade in Science. Other than grades 4 and 7 where all students are tested, students are selected randomly to take either Science or Social Studies.</p> <p>Data has been verified.</p> | | | |

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 | 54,872 | S | 72 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 172 | S | 71 |
| Asian | 708 | S | 90 |
| Black or African American | 19,495 | S | 56 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,062 | S | 69 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 68 | S | 82 |
| White | 30,072 | S | 82 |
| Two or more races | 1,295 | S | 72 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,793 | S | 33 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,337 | S | 64 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 31,934 | S | 62 |
| Migratory students | 13 | S | 69 |
| Male | 28,212 | S | 71 |
| Female | 26,660 | S | 73 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 54,844 | S | 72 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 171 | S | 70 |
| Asian | 696 | S | 86 |
| Black or African American | 19,495 | S | 57 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,048 | S | 68 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 68 | S | 88 |
| White | 30,071 | S | 81 |
| Two or more races | 1,295 | S | 75 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,801 | S | 33 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,302 | S | 61 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 31,920 | S | 62 |
| Migratory students | 13 | S | 77 |
| Male | 28,193 | S | 68 |
| Female | 26,651 | S | 75 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 54,783 | S | 75 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 172 | S | 70 |
| Asian | 708 | S | 89 |
| Black or African American | 19,443 | S | 60 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,061 | S | 71 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 68 | S | 87 |
| White | 30,036 | S | 84 |
| Two or more races | 1,295 | S | 78 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,709 | S | 37 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,336 | S | 64 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 31,869 | S | 65 |
| Migratory students | 13 | S | 77 |
| Male | 28,144 | S | 73 |
| Female | 26,639 | S | 77 |
| <p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels.</p> <p>Data has been verified.</p> | | | |

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 | 53,518 | S | 69 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 164 | S | 57 |
| Asian | 651 | S | 89 |
| Black or African American | 18,954 | S | 53 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,976 | S | 67 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 70 | S | 86 |
| White | 29,567 | S | 79 |
| Two or more races | 1,136 | S | 69 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,638 | S | 29 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,042 | S | 60 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 30,093 | S | 58 |
| Migratory students | 15 | S | 67 |
| Male | 27,389 | S | 66 |
| Female | 26,129 | S | 71 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |

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 | 53,491 | S | 70 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 163 | S | 63 |
| Asian | 637 | S | 84 |
| Black or African American | 18,954 | S | 56 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,964 | S | 64 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 69 | S | 77 |
| White | 29,568 | S | 80 |
| Two or more races | 1,136 | S | 70 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,635 | S | 29 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,008 | S | 53 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 30,077 | S | 59 |
| Migratory students | 15 | S | 40 |
| Male | 27,377 | S | 64 |
| Female | 26,114 | S | 76 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |

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 | 26,804 | S | 76 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 91 | S | 74 |
| Asian | 333 | S | 86 |
| Black or African American | 9,516 | S | 60 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,496 | S | 73 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 32 | S | 78 |
| White | 14,748 | S | 86 |
| Two or more races | 588 | S | 77 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 3,361 | S | 38 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,014 | S | 64 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 15,093 | S | 66 |
| Migratory students | S | S | N< |
| Male | 13,656 | S | 75 |
| Female | 13,148 | S | 76 |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels.

All students are not tested for every elementary grade in Science. Other than grades 4 and 7 where all students are tested, students are selected randomly to take either Science or Social Studies.

Data has been verified.

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 | 50,974 | S | 82 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 138 | S | 84 |
| Asian | 685 | S | 92 |
| Black or African American | 18,021 | S | 71 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,451 | S | 82 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 60 | S | 88 |
| White | 28,613 | S | 89 |
| Two or more races | 1,006 | S | 84 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,004 | S | 42 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,658 | S | 78 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 25,761 | S | 74 |
| Migratory students | S | S | N< |
| Male | 25,836 | S | 80 |
| Female | 25,138 | S | 84 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 51,013 | S | 89 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 138 | S | 85 |
| Asian | 683 | S | 88 |
| Black or African American | 18,035 | S | 83 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,452 | S | 85 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 60 | S | 90 |
| White | 28,637 | S | 93 |
| Two or more races | 1,008 | S | 90 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,020 | S | 54 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,659 | S | 77 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 25,793 | S | 83 |
| Migratory students | S | S | N< |
| Male | 25,852 | S | 86 |
| Female | 25,161 | S | 92 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels. | | | |
| Data has been verified. | | | |

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 | 55,918 | S | 76 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 168 | S | 71 |
| Asian | 798 | S | 86 |
| Black or African American | 18,942 | S | 60 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,709 | S | 73 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 76 | S | 83 |
| White | 32,142 | S | 86 |
| Two or more races | 1,074 | S | 79 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5,786 | S | 41 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,834 | S | 62 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 27,527 | S | 65 |
| Migratory students | S | S | N< |
| Male | 28,387 | S | 75 |
| Female | 27,531 | S | 78 |
| <p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. S.C. is reporting its assessment data for CSPR I with 2 proficiency levels (2=Proficient, 1=Not proficient). Before the update window opens we will send to PSC an updated list of multiple AAL levels and will re-submit the assessment data to reflect those levels.</p> <p>Data has been verified.</p> | | | |

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

| Entity | Total # | Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12 | Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12 |
|-----------|---------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Schools | 1,223 | | |
| Districts | 105 | | |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to File Spec 103 AYP Status is not required since SC' waiver was approved and the state is not determining AYP status for 2011-12.

For states with approval ESEA Flexibility Waiver requests only:

In accordance with your state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, if your state is not making AYP determinations for SY 2011-12, your state is no longer required to report DG32 (AYP status). Therefore, when submitting this file, leave that data group blank.

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 | 509 | | |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 504 | | |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 5 | | |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to File Spec 103 AYP Status is not required since SC' waiver was approved and the state is not determining AYP status for 2011-12.

For states with approval ESEA Flexibility Waiver requests only:

In accordance with your state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, if your state is not making AYP determinations for SY 2011-12, your state is no longer required to report DG32 (AYP status). Therefore, when submitting this file, leave that data group blank.

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 |
|---|--|--|
| 81 | | |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to File Spec 103 AYP Status is not required since SC' waiver was approved and the state is not determining AYP status for 2011-12.

For states with approval ESEA Flexibility Waiver requests only:

In accordance with your state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, if your state is not making AYP determinations for SY 2011-12, your state is no longer required to report DG32 (AYP status). Therefore, when submitting this file, leave that data group blank.

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 | 11 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | 1 |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | 1 |
| Replacement of the principal | 3 |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | 3 |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 2 |
| 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 | 109 |
| 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.

Activities included district oversight committees; external consultants; school data teams with instructional coaches; extended school year with master teachers and district oversight; professional learning communities with district monitoring; Teacher Advancement Program; Palmetto Priority Schools initiative; instructional coaches; lateral governance with a new curriculum.

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.

The Title I Team in the Office of Federal and State Accountability offer ongoing support to districts identified for improvement or corrective action. This support is provided via assigned Education Associates for each district and one Education Associate assigned to assist districts in corrective action. There were Blackboard sessions (virtual meetings) held for districts in improvement or corrective action. Each meeting was focused on support offered through the Statewide System of Support, the planning process for districts newly identified for improvement, and the process for the SCDE to impose a corrective action in districts identified as in corrective action.

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 | 28 |
| Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district | 26 |
| Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds | 6 |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP | 0 |
| Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district | 0 |
| Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district | 0 |
| Restructured the district | 0 |
| Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action) | 0 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | |

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

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

| | |
|---|---------|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete | 8/31/12 |
|---|---------|

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State level funds were used to evaluate and monitor the progress of funded applicants. The SCDE was involved in developing and delivering comprehensive leadership and technical assistance. The SCDE used the SEA-retained funds to:

- provide oversight of fund allocation and program management for subgrantees, monitor school improvement efforts, and verify fidelity of implementation at site level
- coordinate and provide consulting and professional development to subgrantee schools and districts through in-house and an external service providers
- evaluate (with evaluator) the effectiveness of program implementation
- contract with external service providers to provide onsite assistance
- support/offset administrative, training, and technical assistance costs.

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.

Some schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are part of the Palmetto Priority Schools initiative. Through this initiative, schools are assigned liaisons who make visits to support the schools improvement efforts. The South Carolina Department of Education works in collaboration with partners across the state to provide assistance to these schools.

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 | 98,502 |
| Applied to transfer | 2,209 |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 1,493 |
| 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 | \$ 4,198,165 |

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 | 13 |

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

| |
|---|
| 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 | 295,980 |
| Applied for supplemental educational services | 16,921 |
| Received supplemental educational services | 12,701 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | |

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

| Spending on Supplemental Educational Services | Amount |
|---|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services | \$ 14,128,667 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | |

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

| | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| All classes | 216,703 | 210,322 | 97.06 | 6,381 | 2.94 |
| All elementary classes | 129,840 | 127,686 | 98.34 | 2,154 | 1.66 |
| All secondary classes | 86,863 | 82,636 | 95.13 | 4,227 | 4.87 |

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.

South Carolina uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

| Elementary School Classes | Percentage |
|--|-------------------|
| Elementary school classes 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 | 20.00 |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 15.00 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 28.00 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 37.00 |
| Total | 100.00 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

HQ special education teachers who are instructing students with disabilities out of area, such as HQ LD teaching EMD or HQ elementary teachers who are teaching special subjects, such as Spanish, art, or music to elementary students.

| Secondary School Classes | Percentage |
|--|-------------------|
| 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) | 34.00 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 28.00 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 38.00 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 0.00 |
| Total | 100.00 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

| School Type | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Elementary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty Elementary Schools | 24,377 | 23,554 | 96.62 |
| Low-poverty Elementary Schools | 40,434 | 39,895 | 98.67 |
| Secondary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty secondary Schools | 14,180 | 13,048 | 92.02 |
| Low-Poverty secondary Schools | 31,258 | 29,959 | 95.84 |

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 | 92.60 | 65.80 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or eligible for Medicaid. | |
| Secondary schools | 85.60 | 59.70 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or eligible for Medicaid. | |

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

| | |
|---|--------|
| Number of ALL LEP students in the State | 38,553 |
| 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. | 35,369 |
| 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 | 30,692 |
| Russian | 977 |
| Vietnamese | 753 |
| Chinese | 637 |
| Arabic | 540 |

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 | 35,778 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 3,167 |
| Total | 38,945 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Reasons for not tested: students completed all coursework for graduation prior to administration of test; students enrolled after testing window; students coded incorrectly in student database (should not have been tested). Also, Kindergartners would not have previously been tested unless they had been retained and neither would newcomers who had not taken the EPT the previous year. | |

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

| All LEP Results | # |
|---|-------|
| Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 3,369 |
| Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 9.42 |
| 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 | 35,624 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 3,154 |
| Total | 38,778 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | |

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

| 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. | 7,193 |

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 | 11,493 | 40.42 | 6,977 | 22.00 |
| Attained proficiency | 3,355 | 9.42 | 634 | 2.00 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | | | | |

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not applicable. |

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. Not applicable. |

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not applicable. |

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 |
|------------|------------|-------|
| 932 | 536 | 1,468 |

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 |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 1,467 | S | 97 | 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 |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 1,467 | S | 98 | 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 |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 788 | S | 96 | 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 | 73 |
| //////////////////////////////////// | |
| # - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 48 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1 | 70 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2 | 68 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3 | 53 |
| //////////////////////////////////// | |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs | 0 |
| //////////////////////////////////// | |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12) | 1 |
| # - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years | 1 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12) | 1 |

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. Counted each LEA which received funds regardless of consortium affiliation.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

| | |
|--|------------------|
| State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs | <u> </u> No |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state failed to meet AMAO 3. The ELA Mean Target for High Schools was not met. | |

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4,122 | 166 | 2 |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

| Title III Teachers | # |
|--|-----|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 512 |
| Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 80 |

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 is a revised estimate for the number of teachers needed in the next 5 years based on an analysis of the state's needs. Figures reported in prior years may have included total teachers instead of additional teachers are requested.

* 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 | 69 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 62 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 57 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 54 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 62 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 0 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Participant Information | # Subgrantees | # Participants |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 71 | 21,501 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 65 | 1,778 |
| PD provided to principals | 63 | 997 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 63 | 1,280 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 60 | 2,774 |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel | 41 | 636 |
| Total | 363 | 28,966 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/\$\$ Distribution |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 07/13/12 | 08/30/12 | 48 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Unsure of error. Dates have been verified and are in requested format. | | |

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The above date was the date by which the fastest LEAs returned their final budget reports and signed grant awards from their superintendent to the SEA after the SEA made the final allocation amounts available to all LEAs. Other LEAs submitted their budget items to the SCDE at various rates, some slower than others, and these were then processed as quickly as possible by the SEA. Please note that there are several other offices involved in processing the grant awards to LEAs including the General Counsel, Finance and the Superintendent's office, all of which must take action before Title III money is actually available for LEAs to expend. For 2011-12 this process proceeded more quickly with the new electronic routing system that was in place that reduced the amount of time it took to complete the routing process.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

| LEAs | # | # LEAs Reporting Data |
|---|----------|------------------------------|
| LEAs without subgrants | 70 | 70 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 14 | 14 |
| Total | 84 | 84 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | | |

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

| Age/Grade | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 101 | 231 |
| K | 400 | 628 |
| 1 | 403 | 618 |
| 2 | 362 | 576 |
| 3 | 390 | 523 |
| 4 | 336 | 563 |
| 5 | 356 | 578 |
| 6 | 338 | 418 |
| 7 | 288 | 406 |
| 8 | 255 | 405 |
| 9 | 345 | 416 |
| 10 | 247 | 307 |
| 11 | 211 | 263 |
| 12 | 253 | 278 |
| Ungraded | | |
| Total | 4,285 | 6,210 |

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Ungraded students equals zero.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

| Primary Nighttime Residence | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|---|--|---|
| Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care | 414 | 730 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 3,122 | 4,423 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 93 | 522 |
| Hotels/Motels | 656 | 535 |
| Total | 4,285 | 6,210 |

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

| Age/Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age Birth Through 2 | 276 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 353 |
| K | 822 |
| 1 | 830 |
| 2 | 744 |
| 3 | 749 |
| 4 | 732 |
| 5 | 783 |
| 6 | 583 |
| 7 | 562 |
| 8 | 537 |
| 9 | 646 |
| 10 | 455 |
| 11 | 381 |
| 12 | 442 |
| Ungraded | |
| Total | 8,895 |

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

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.

| Subgroups | # Homeless Students Served |
|--|----------------------------|
| Unaccompanied homeless youth | 862 |
| Migratory children/youth | 18 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,544 |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) students | 297 |

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 | 754 | 501 |
| 4 | 760 | 487 |
| 5 | 793 | 488 |
| 6 | 686 | 364 |
| 7 | 599 | 339 |
| 8 | 546 | 285 |
| High School | 388 | 301 |

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 | 757 | 422 |
| 4 | 764 | 487 |
| 5 | 796 | 497 |
| 6 | 686 | 366 |
| 7 | 601 | 338 |
| 8 | 548 | 267 |
| High School | 385 | 247 |

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 | 377 | 169 |
| 4 | 765 | 456 |
| 5 | 421 | 250 |
| 6 | 340 | 156 |
| 7 | 599 | 366 |
| 8 | 261 | 152 |
| High School | 439 | 257 |

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

- a. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.
- b. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

| Age/Grade | 12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|---|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 227 |
| K | 90 |
| 1 | 76 |
| 2 | 61 |
| 3 | 46 |
| 4 | 62 |
| 5 | 41 |
| 6 | 41 |
| 7 | 20 |
| 8 | 17 |
| 9 | 26 |
| 10 | 18 |
| 11 | 13 |
| 12 | 6 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 521 |
| Total | 1,265 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. | |

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2009-2010 1,201 students were counted for Category 1; in 2010-2011 1,118 students were counted for Category 1; and for 2011-2012 1,273 students were identified for Category 1 resulting in a 14 percent increase from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. This augmentation is attributed to several causations:

- ? an increase in the amount of State recruiters;
- ? intensification of direct training and support to LEA staff by State recruiters;
- ? and a rise in the amount of children that migrated with their families in some districts.

The increase in the Category 1 count predominantly comes from students identified during the summer; the time period when South Carolina receives migrants from sending States, primarily Florida. There are certain growers that use exclusively H2A workers, such as peach growers and nurseries, however for tomatoes and watermelons migratory workers are generally employed. According to the SC Department of Employment and Workforce 3,080 H2A and 6,000 migrant/seasonal farm workers were expected to be employed in SC for the 2012 harvests. The USDA ranked SC as ranking 2nd in the US for peaches, 6th for all tobacco and watermelon, and 9th for tomatoes for 2011. These crops require the labor of many of the estimated 11,000 agricultural workers. In light of this information an effort was made to increase ID&R activities. SCMEP employed five State level recruiters in 2012 to identify and serve migrants State wide, and to provide technical and supportive ID&R and service support to the six LEAs with Summer Program. The increase level of State Recruiters directly correlated with the increase of 155 migrants identified from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012 year resulting in a higher Category 1 count.

Another factor contributing to this increase was the increase of direct training

In 2009-2010 1,201 students were counted for Category 1; in 2010-2011 1,118 students were counted for Category 1; and for 2011-2012 1,273 students were identified for Category 1 resulting in a 14 percent increase from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. This augmentation is attributed to several causations:

- ? an increase in the amount of State recruiters;
- ? intensification of direct training and support to LEA staff by State recruiters;
- ? and a rise in the amount of children that migrated with their families in some districts.

The increase in the Category 1 count predominantly comes from students identified during the summer; the time period when South Carolina receives migrants from sending States, primarily Florida. There are certain growers that use exclusively H2A workers, such as peach growers and nurseries, however for tomatoes and watermelons migratory workers are generally employed. According to the SC Department of Employment and Workforce 3,080 H2A and 6,000 migrant/seasonal farm workers were expected to be employed in SC for the 2012 harvests. The USDA ranked SC as ranking 2nd in the US for peaches, 6th for all tobacco and watermelon, and 9th for tomatoes for 2011. These crops require the labor of many of the estimated 11,000 agricultural workers. In light of this information an effort was made to increase ID&R activities. SCMEP employed five State level recruiters in 2012 to identify and serve migrants State wide, and to provide technical and supportive ID&R and service support to the six LEAs with Summer Program. The increase level of State Recruiters directly correlated with the increase of 155 migrants identified from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012 year resulting in a higher Category 1 count.

Another factor contributing to this increase was the increase of direct training and support to LEA staff by State recruiters. More State recruiters resulted in approximately 80 hours of training and support to LEA staff members and local recruiters, directly impacting the amount of students identified in the districts.

Increases in State recruiters and their training to LEAs unequivocally augmented the amount of students identify for the Category 1 count, nonetheless the extraneous factor to SCMEP that influenced an increase can be attributed to the amount of children that migrated with families this year. The case of the LEA Beaufort is an illustration. Beaufort is ideal for gauging the influence of external factors since all camps are located in a geographically limited area, an island, with established camps rendering the ID&R process straightforward; that is, it is very unlikely to not identify all eligible migrants for MEP since the population is found in a concentrated area. In 2010-2011 x students were identified, x k-12, and x OSY. In 2011-2012 x k-12 students and x OSY were identified. This increase can be attributed to the increase of actual eligible students who migrated this year.

In summary, the internal program factors of increased numbers of State recruiters engaged in identification and recruitment at the State level, and their assistance to LEAs, coupled with augmentation of migrants present for the summer harvest resulted in a direct correlation of 14% increase for the Category 1 count from 2010-2011 to the 2011-2012 year.

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) | 136 |
| K | 73 |
| 1 | 68 |
| 2 | 44 |
| 3 | 29 |
| 4 | 42 |
| 5 | 35 |
| 6 | 23 |
| 7 | 18 |
| 8 | 14 |
| 9 | 11 |
| 10 | 10 |
| 11 | 5 |
| 12 | 3 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 374 |
| Total | 885 |
| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. . | |

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reported Category 2 count for 2009-2010 was 667, whereas for 2010-2011 it was 602. For 2011-2012 the Category 2 count is 885. This 47% increase is due to internal SCMEP occurrences congruent with those that augmented the Category

2 count namely:

? an increase in the amount of State recruiters;

? intensification of direct training and support to LEA staff by State recruiters;

? the extensive use of materials and services strategies devolved by the SOSY consortium which SC is a member.

The employment of five State recruiters allowed not only for an augmentation in the amount of qualifying migrants recruited, but also for the amount of OSY that were able to receive summer services. Having more recruiters Statewide allowed for concentration in service deliver to OSY in certain areas. To illustrate, in the southern part of the State, close to his home- base, one recruiter was able to deliver classes to 29 OSY using SOSY developed materials and strategies.

The two veteran State recruiters had assisted in developing, and had been trained in the use of SOSY materials and strategies. Ergo, they were adept at efficiently training the other State recruiters and LEA staff in their use. The two veteran State recruiters provide Technical Assistance and Professional Development to LEA staff on 12 distinct occasions lasting from 5-12 hours, resulting in over 80 hours of direct training. This training included using SOSY materials and strategies in order to improve and increase services to OSY.

The increase of training and the implementation of SOSY materials and strategies, along with the increase of State level recruiters resulted in a positive increase in the amount of Summer services provided to OSY. Summer services rose among k-12 students due to the external factor of actual students present for the summer school programs in certain districts.

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.

MIS 2000 was used at the State and local level for 2011-2012, and 2010-2011, to accumulate and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count. Each qualifying student is recorded on a paper COE by a State or local recruiter. The COE used by SCMEP contains all minimally required fields in addition to fields relevant to the State and was approved by OME in 2009.

Each COE is manually entered either at the State or local level. The initial input of the COE information constitutes a first revision for validity and reliability of information. Each COE is further verified for accuracy at the State level. This final revision involves manual verification of the original COE to its corresponding digital input in MIS2000. A multi layered processes of ensuring the validity and reliability of the data by a manual check of the original COE and the information entered in MIS2000 minimized input errors.

The MIS2000 system, original paper COEs, along with manual verification of the hard copy and digital copy of student information will continue to be employed for the 2012-2013 year. Furthermore, as in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, MIS2000 will be employed to generate both the Category 1 and Category 2 child 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.

Data collection for the Category 1 and Category 2 counts were gathered by State and local staff. State and local recruiters commenced the process by conducting personal interviews with migrant families and OSY. State recruitment occurred throughout the year by two veteran State recruiters. Three additional State recruiters were employed for the peak recruitments season of May - November 2012. The six LEAs receiving that hold MEP Summer Programs initiated in May 2012. Recruitment occurred primarily at the residences of families/OSY, such as in camps and trailers. However, recruitment also occurred at other milieus such as: stores; during breaks at work with the employer's permission; and at the summer school. Families and OSY were found via: pre-existing knowledge of areas where families/OSY lived and worked; and collaboration and referrals from inter-intra-State agencies such as East Coast Migrant Head Start, South Carolina Primary Health Migrant Health Program, South Carolina Employment and Work Force, local Farmers, Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT), and recruiters from other States. Information of students that qualified for the SC MEP were recorded on a standard state paper COE. Information was verified by State and local staff who provided services to the families/OSY, and also by a random interview process.

The SC MEP uses a standard paper COE that was verified by the OME in 2009. Data fields on the COE include the minimal information required by the OME. Additional information collected includes a space for Hispanic indicator and race as needed for EDFacts, along with primary language, OSY years of education, LEP/IEP status, birth city, grade, and a space for comments. The information collected from the COEs is entered into the MIS2000 system by local or State data personnel. Validity and reliability were insured to avoid duplication of information this is accomplished by a multi-layered process of ensuring the validity and reliability of the data by a manual check of the original COE and the information entered in MIS2000 minimized input errors. Each COE is manually entered either at the State or local level. The initial input of the COE information constitutes a first revision for validity and reliability of information. Each COE is further verified for accuracy at the State level. This final revision involves manual verification of the original COE to its corresponding digital input in MIS2000. Each COE is manually entered either at the State or local level. The initial input of the COE information constitutes a first revision for validity and reliability of information. Each COE is further verified for accuracy at the State level. This final revision involves manual verification of the original COE to its corresponding digital input in MIS2000. As in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, MIS2000 will be employed to generate both the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

Category 2 child counts commenced with the collection of COE information and verification described above, but there were additional procedures to verify that students received academic and support services during the summer. State recruiters were also trained in providing services by South Carolina's participation in the consortium SOSY. SOSY materials and strategies were extensively drawn upon to serve OSY statewide. Printed paper forms of the SOSY OSY tracking form and pre/post-tests based on SOSY materials were used during the summer session, from 20 May- 31 August 2012 to track the attendance and performance of the OSY. This information was then recorded in MIS2000 by the State recruiters, the records were first verified by the SC MEP State Coordinator in September 2012 and then by the MEP Data Coordinator in November 2012. This multi-stage verification process ensured the validity of the data entered into MIS2000, which in turn allowed the system to generate the Category 2 count based on reliable and valid information.

Category 2 child counts at the local level, for the six LEAs that received MEP funding for summer programs, also commenced with the collection of COE information and verification. However local staff recorded student enrollment and participation in the MEP summer program. Recruitment began by local recruiters in May 2012. Services among the LEAs commenced between the third weeks of May, to the first week of June 2012 and were provided by teachers. Some LEA teachers used the SOSY OSY tracking form to record student enrollment for OSY and Family Literacy. Assessment of OSY progress was done by some LEAs by purchased standardized tests; other districts used assessments based on SOSY materials from mid-May- 31 August 2012. K-12 students' daily attendance was recorded on paper by teachers from the commencement of the program from mid-May-beginning of June (depending on the opening of the Summer School). Assessment of student progress was done by a combination of computerized and paper tests.

Local Data Personnel entered into MIS2000 the information that indicated the student qualified for the Category 2 count, such as being served for summer, the dates of enrollment, and the specific instruction and support received. The attendance rosters/tracking forms were submitted to the State. The SC MEP State Data Manager verified, student by student, the paper record to the information in MIS2000 to ensure that students who were served during the summer were accurately recorded to count for Category 2, MIS2000 generated the report after fastidious verification of source information.

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.

SC MEP holds ten licensures for MIS2000. Seven of the ten are on computers in custody of the six LEAs that have summer programs (the largest program holds two), two are with the State level recruiters (one who is also the SC MEP Data Manager), and one is with the SC MEP State Coordinator. After face to face interviews by recruiters have been conducted to collect the information for the paper COEs, local data managers manually input the information into their respective MIS2000 systems. State recruiters manually enter the information for the paper COEs collected at the State level. Each COE is reviewed and signed after the initial interview. Review of COE information is done at the local level usually by the Data Manager and at the State level usually by the State Coordinator or Data Manager. The review assists with the reduction of duplication.

Other measures are taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the information collected on the COEs. Normally, two-three weeks after the commencement of the LEA summer schools (from around the third week of May to the first week of June) State recruiters conduct random interviews of COEs collected at each of the six LEAs and at the State level. This random sampling allows for verification of the accuracy of information needed for Category 1 count and also serves as an opportunity to update any information necessary.

Duplication of student information is also minimized by the multi-stage review process. Recruiters first fill out COE information in the field on paper COEs. These COEs are inputted into MIS2000 at the local level by Data personnel who verify the completion of the information. Before the commencement of each entry the Data Personnel updates their local MIS2000 to ensure that COE information entered throughout the State is current. When the COEs are inputted the Data personnel must conduct a multi-level search to ensure that the student has not already been entered. This search includes: searching for the student by birthdate only; by the first few letters of the first last name and first name; and searching by the first few letters of the second last name as if it were the first. This intense search is crucial to ensure that students whose names might have been given and/or recorded differently are not counted more than once. State level personnel complete the same process when they input State identified COEs.

All original COEs and the corresponding information in MIS2000 are reviewed by the MEP State Data Manager, one COE at a time. Furthermore, duplication is curtailed by periodic generation of reports of students conducted throughout the year by the State Data Manager. Student information is updated on MIS2000 based on home visits with families, during the provision of services; though telephone conversations with parents/OSY; and through the re-interview process.

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.

Data for SC MEP Category 2 count is maintained by the same processes utilized for the Category 1 count as described in the preceding answer. However there is a slight collection difference for Category 2 information. As detailed above, Category 2 child counts at the local level, for the six LEAs that received MEP funding for summer programs, also commenced with the collection of COE information and verification. However, local staff recorded student enrollment and participation in the MEP summer program. Recruitment began by local recruiters in May 2012. Services among the LEAs commenced between the third weeks of May, to the first week of June 2012 and were provided by teachers. Some LEA teachers used the SOSY OSY tracking form to record student enrollment for OSY and Family Literacy. Assessment of OSY progress was done by some LEAs by purchased standardized tests; other districts used assessments based on SOSY materials from mid-May- 31 August 2012. K-12 students' daily attendance was recorded on paper by teachers from the commencement of the program from mid-May-beginning of June (depending on the opening of the Summer School). Assessment of student progress was done by a combination of computerized and paper tests.

Local Data Personnel entered into MIS2000 the information that indicated the student qualified for the Category 2 count, such as being served for summer, the dates of enrollment, and the specific instruction and support received. The attendance rosters/tracking forms were submitted to the State. State recruiters were also trained in providing services by South Carolina's participation in the consortium SOSY. SOSY materials and strategies were extensively drawn upon to serve OSY statewide. Printed paper forms of the SOSY OSY tracking form and pre/post-tests based on SOSY materials were used during the summer session, from 20 May- 31 August 2012 to track the attendance and performance of the OSY. This information was then recorded in MIS2000 by the State recruiters, the records were first verified by the SC MEP State Coordinator in September 2012 and then by the MEP Data Coordinator in November 2012. This multi-stage verification process ensured the validity of the data entered into MIS2000, which in turn allowed the system to generate the Category 2 count based on reliable and valid information.

The SC MEP State Data Manager verified, student by student, the paper records submitted and inputted by local and state staff to the information in M182000 in order to ensure that students who were served during the summer were accurately recorded to count for Category 2, M182000 generated the report after meticulous verification of source information.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information collected to be inputted in the State's database, MIS2000, commences with a face to face interview with the family/OSY. Identification and recruitment (ID&R) normally takes place at the residence (migrant camps, trailers, motels), though a small percentage of qualifying students are identified during breaks in the fields, packing houses, at stores, and laundry mats. South Carolina MEP is a summer only program owing to the peak of migration during the summer months, though there are some H2A workers and some migratory families that arrive in early spring for certain crops such. Furthermore, some families/OSY migrant back to SC from northern States for the second crop of tomatoes in the late summer early fall before they migrant back to Florida for the winter. Due to these patterns SCMEP hires State level recruiters during the peak months (apart from the Lead State Recruiter/Data Manager who works year round). The six LEAs that receive MEP funds for summer, hire local recruiters during this time period as well. State and local recruiters thus meet face to face with migrant families/OSY to determine eligibility; the information of qualified students is recorded on a paper State-wide COE. This information is then entered into MIS2000 by the local staff or at the State level if ID&R was conducted by State Recruiters. By conducting face to face interviews only COEs of students/OSY under 22 years of age, who have not graduated from High School or attained a GED, and who were present at least for one day are identified. This protocol allows for more reliable and valid information for the Category 1 Child Count. Authenticity of the Category 2 Child Count is verified by attendance records and/or OSY tracking forms.

The SEA continuously engages in quality control procedures. At the local and State level, the Data personnel are responsible for reviewing the information recorded on the COE before it is entered into MIS2000. If there is missing or questionable information the recruiter is notified and obtains/clarifies the information. The data personnel or the LEA supervisor signs off on the authenticity of the information. COE information is inputted into MIS2000; each student is assigned a specific student number. To minimize student duplication each name is searched for at least three different ways. A search is done for the first few letters of the first last name and the first name for any matches; to see if the child's name has been put into the system before so that another student id number is not created. If there are no matches another search is by the first few letters of the second last name as if it was the first last name in case the last names have been inverted. As a third check before entry, a search will be done by data of birth only, to see if there are similar names with different spellings. If in any of these searches a name seems like a likely match, then other information collected on the COE such as parents' names and the student's birth place, and migration patterns are compared. If there are no likely matches then the student is entered into MIS2000 as a new student with a new student id number. If there was a match the unique student id number is selected and the new qualifying information is recorded. Another measure to prevent duplicate information is the constant consultation of MSIX. All LEAs have a MSIX id assigned to them and are instructed to consult MSIX for cross referencing student information. At the State level, the State coordinator and the Data manager constantly resolve MSIX worklist numbers; in doing so they are able to spot any students that may have duplicate information. Another measure in ensuring accuracy is the review process. The State conducts site visits, provides technical assistance and professional development for LEAs and State recruiters to ensure that all are aware of eligibility requirements which, in turn makes data on the Category 1 and Category 2 counts more valid and reliable. The SEA runs continuous reports in MIS2000 to check Category 1 and Category 2 counts, and the State Data person, along with the State Coordinator continually review information on original COEs and its corresponding data in MIS2000. A final check is performed in which each data element from each original COE is verified one by one in MIS2000.

Each child count is calculated based on the above criteria. It is known if the student was in the State by face to face interviews; the count is unduplicated due to the standards explained above in the compilation process. The specific edit functions built into MiS2000 to generate an accurate child count are shown below. These reports allow only students that meet the eligibility criteria to be counted. Reports generate information by age group; those that are under three years of age are subtracted from the final numbers before submission. The criteria used to select students for these the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts:

Category 1 (N121)

- School History.QA3Date >= !StartDate
- Student.TWENTYSECONDBDAY >= !StartDate
- Student.BIRTHDATE <= !EndDate
- ((School History.FUNDINGDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.RESDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.WITHDRAWDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.QADate is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.ENROLLDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate))
- School History.DOMID = SC
- ((School History.STUDENTSEQ is not null) or (School History.STUDENTSEQ = !RegularEndDate) or (School History.STUDENTSEQ <> !RegularEndDate))
- ((Student.TWENTYSECONDBDAY >= School History.FUNDINGDATE) and (((Student.THIRDBDAY <= School History.WITHDRAWDATE) or (School History.WITHDRAWDATE is null))))

Category 2 (N124)

- ((School History.QA3Date >= !StartDate) or (Student.CONTSVCSREASON is not null))
- Student.BIRTHDATE <= !EndDate
- Student.TWENTYSECONDBDAY >= !StartDate
- ((School History.ENROLLDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.QADate is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.RESDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.FUNDINGDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.WITHDRAWDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate))
- School History.DOMID = SC
- ((Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 001) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 002) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 003) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 004) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 005) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 006) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 007) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 008) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 009) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 010) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 011) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 012) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 013) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 014) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 015) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 016) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 017) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 018) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 019) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 020) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 021) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 022) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 025) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 026) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 027) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 028) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 029) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 030) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 031) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 035) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 036) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 037) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 038) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 039) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 040) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 041) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 042) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 043) or (Supplemental Program.SPCODE = 044))
- ((School History.TYPE

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.

Both the Category 1 and Category 2 counts are generated by the same protocols and data system.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

SC MEP utilizes a multi-layered verification process at both the State and local levels to increase validity and reliability of data for Child Counts from 01 September - 31 August that are entered into the MIS2000 database. This process begins with training, continues throughout the program execution, and is confirmed upon review of the program.

State level recruiters, data personnel, and staff are trained throughout the year, while LEA recruiters, data personnel, and staff commence training in March and receive professional development and technical assistance throughout the summer session. Both State level recruiters, and LEA recruiters and staff were provided with a SCMEP Recruiter Information Kit. This Kit included among other things: the SC MEP Recruiter Handbook; a copy of legislation; an explanation of McKinney- Vento and Migrant students; indigenous languages guide; the SC Migrant Health Program Contract Provider List; and a thumb drive with MEP and SOSY resources (such as Field Based Recruiting Guide, OSY profile with instructions, OSY Educational Outcomes table, etc.). The March training includes eligibility requirements and definitions of eligibility; furthermore, State recruiters provide assistance throughout the summer program for the LEAs for any questions regarding eligibility.

Local staff participated in the development of the updated Comprehensive Needs Assessment/Service Delivery Plan (CNA/SDP) in 2011. They were provided a copy and training on the use of the CNA/SDP for the summer 2012 program. Furthermore LEA staff was provided details of written procedures for collection of pupil enrollment reports and attendance data apart from the CNA/SDP in the Migrant Program application information and instructions. LEA data enter personnel received collective training at on review of records and the recording of student information in MIS2000 at the March training. Technical support was given by the two State veteran recruiters to individual LEA data staff on 10 separate sessions throughout the summer program in 2012. In addition local data personnel were provided ample support by calling MIS2000 support staff; the stipulation for support service is provided by the State by contract to MIS2000.

The verification process of student eligibility for Child Counts continued with the execution of the summer program for the LEAs, and throughout the year for State level recruiters. The OME approved SC Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is standard use for the recruitment of migrant students and OSY, all COEs are obtained by a personal interview with parents/guardians/responsible adult/ or Out of School Youth in order to ensure the edibility of the student/OSY. State recruiters receive year round training about eligibility especially through the participation in the Out of School Youth Consortium, and also via review of OME guidance and frequently asked questions. Local staff and recruiters all have the cellphone numbers of the veteran recruiters and call immediately if there are any questions regarding eligibility of students. Verification of Child Count eligibility is further strengthened during the summer school program by re-interview processes that randomly selects students for verification of eligibility information.

Student eligibility and verification of Child Counts continues with the review process. COEs completed at the local level are reviewed by and signed off by senior staff and/or data personnel before being entered into MIS2000. If there is missing/incomplete/incorrect information the local recruiters are notified and retrieve/rectify the information. State level completed COEs are scrutinized and signed off by the state level staff entering the data in MIS2000, if there is inaccurate/incomplete information the recruiter is informed and corrects the discrepancy. In addition, at the end of the summer program each COE obtained during the summer, and throughout the year, along with its corresponding information, including supporting documentation (such as OSY tracking forms, OSY profiles, student attendance records, etc.) are reviewed one at a time both on the paper original and the corresponding information in MIS2000 in order to minimize data discrepancy. The SEA also conducts on-site monitoring visits to each of the six LEAs receiving summer MEP funding. Monitoring includes a review of COEs, attendance records, assessments, teaching/service observation, a review of data entry into MIS2000, eligibility documentation, equipment/supply purchase documentation, staff hours/expenses, etc.

The SEA constantly revises recruitment strategies based on information gained from professional development, such as consortium trainings, information gained from other agencies such as Migrant Health, and East Coast Migrant Head Start, etc. One specific illustration of the evaluation and revision of recruitment procedures in the summer 2012 was the creation of a Google Maps with pins of all migrant camps, growers, school districts, clinics, community resources, etc. for migrants. This initiative came about when the veteran recruiters calculated that it would be inefficient to take each of the three new state recruiters to all of the areas that the veteran recruiters had become familiar with over the years. After discussion for various strategies to impart the accumulated knowledge of the veteran recruiters, it was decided that the use of technology was the most effective and efficient means of relying years of recruitment knowledge to new recruiters

via the creation of a map. This map was also shared with the LEAs.

In sum SCMEP proactively implements a multi-tiered approach to ensure the most accurate information to ensure that information of Child Counts are as accurate as possible. This approach includes training, program implementation and review. This process is carried out for state and local level recruiters, staff, and data personnel.

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.

In 2011 SC completed the third year of the reinterview cycle which required external verification. SC coupled with NCMEP. The trained NC recruiters were able to reinterview a total of 52 students with a 0% defect rate; that is, all migrants reinterviewed qualified, however there were some minor errors found, such as a birthdate being a month off, or a different birth city in Mexico mentioned.

This 2011 discrepancy rate was less than 5% and constituted the guidelines for reinterviews for 2012. The SCMEP followed the 2010 OME Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing p14 and achieve at least minimum 50 re-interviews state wide. In 2012 a total of 104 students were reinterviewed with a 69% response rate; all reinterviews qualified resulting in an accuracy level of 100% based on the sample (please refer to the table below). Due to the low discrepancy rate from 2011, it was decided to conduct reinterviews at the LEA level in order to gauge accuracy rates in individual districts. It was also decided that since the enrollment peaks in the summer a snap shot/rolling sample would be taking after the commencement of the summer season. The snap shot sample was decided in order that a district could have its reinterviews done on one specific day, but all districts would not have reinterviews conducted on the same day owing to limitations of State level personnel. A rolling sample was decided so that reinterviews could be conducted during the ongoing recruitment processes during the peak summer season. Furthermore it was deemed prudent to lower non-response rate by conducting prospective reinterviews closely after original identification; this is crucial for SCMEP since the majority of families/OSY peak in June-July and are only present for two-five weeks.

Reinterviews were conducted face to face with the OSY/guardian/parent, there were a few reinterviews that were not found in person and had to be completed over the telephone. State level recruiters conducted reinterviews, the majority were conducted by the veteran State recruiters who have been extensively trained in the reinterview process and completed the reinterviews for NCMEP in 2011. Two of the newer State recruiters assisted in the reinterview process and were trained by the veteran recruiters beforehand. No recruiter reinterviewed on a COE they had completed.

The specific procedure for the simple random sampling of reinterviewing at the district level was as followed:

1. All individuals on all of the COEs completed as of that day for the LEA summer program 2012 were physically numbered on each of the COEs.
2. Calculated 20% of the total, to give a number of the students that should be randomly selected to be reinterviewed the rationale was that 5% of re-interviewing could be obtained, or that that 15% of migrants will not be available for re-interview.
3. Have someone point to a number from the random numbers table in the appendix of Bernard, R. H. (1995) Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, CA: AltaMira Press.
4. Commence selection of determined reinterview numbers by looking at the hundredths digit and disregarding any number over the number chosen to reinterview.
5. Select the COEs of the students in which the determined numbers randomly selected appear and verify that they still qualify.
6. Attempt reinterview face to face recording answers on separate reinterview sheet, ensuring that the reinterview was not to be conducted by the original recruiter.
8. If family/OSY not contacted face to face attempt telephone contact and record answers on separate reinterview sheet.
7. Attempt reinterviews of all of the randomly selected students so as to minimize bias of oversampling.

It should be noted that all of the six LEAs receiving MEP summer funding were reinterviewed except for Colleton. Reinterviews were not completed in Colleton due to several factors. The SCMEP State Coordinator had resigned in

January, and although the head of the immediate division took responsibility for the Program she was not as familiar with the program as the veteran State recruiters who had been with the program for nine seasons, and six seasons respectively. They assisted at the administrative level, along with: providing technical assistance and professional development for the new State recruiters and LEA staff; recruitment and identification activities; providing OSY classes; providing supplement and support services; reviewing COEs and recruitment activities of LEAs and new State Recruiters; maintaining MSIX and MIS2000 databases; inputting COEs and student information in MIS2000; conducting monitoring visits; etc. New State

recruiters were instrumental in increasing migrants found and served for 2012, and they did assist in the reinterview process. In light of the above, and considering that the timeframe for the peak of migrants in SC is limited, only two-four weeks, it was deemed that the new State recruiters should focus more on ID&R activities than on reinterviews. There was no grave concern regarding the defect rate based on the 2011 external reinterviews. Furthermore, by the time the reinterviews had been completed in the other districts the majority of migrants had moved from Colleton to more northern States. Since the threshold of a minimum of 50 reinterviews had been conducted with no disqualifications, and Colleton had reinterviews conducted in 2011, it was decided not to attempt reinterviews on the migrants that had left Colleton, thus there were no reinterviews for Colleton for 2012.

In sum a total of 107 random samples were completed with no defect rate. There were as in 2011, some minor errors which were immediately corrected such as an inverted last name (the second last name put as the first last name), a birthdate off by a month, a different town in Florida mentioned than what was originally recorded as the student migrating from, and a Mexican State, listed as a birth city.

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.

Currently the SCMEP does not merge data with any intra-state data base. All migrant data is collected on federally approved paper COEs after a face to face interview with the family/OSY to verify eligibility. All original COEs are submitted to the State office and inputted into MIS2000. This system does conduct nightly merges with MSIX. The SCMEP State Coordinator and the lead State recruiter/Data Personnel receive and review MSIX near match worklist items almost diurnally in order to ensure update information of students.

The SCMEP State Coordinator also speaks with Title I coordinators to inform them of the correct procedures of identification of migrant students. The State Coordinator speaks to the Title I coordinators collectively, at least bi-annually, at the Title I Coordinators meeting, and at the SC Association of Title I Administrators meeting. They are instructed that if migrant students are identified in their schools they must fill out a SCMEP COE and send the original to the State office. Furthermore they are informed that all migrants identified need to be marked as Migrant in the State Data System, PowerSchool.

The majority of migrants identified in SC are recruited by the SCMEP. At the beginning of each school year, each school district is provided a Categorical Eligibility list of migrant students that were identified in their district. The names of the students are checked against school enrolment records to ensure that, if they are present they are receiving the free meal service for migrant children. In the letter accompanying the list there is a reminder that COEs need to be completed and sent to the State office of any children they have identified as migrant that are not on the list. This allows the State staff to ensure that the child count data are updated.

Further practices that ensure accuracy of inputted and updated information on child counts include: the manual revision of COE information, checked against the information inputted into MIS2000; verification of MSIX notices with the information of student information in MIS2000; a periodic print out of student names to ensure no duplications of names; periodic verification of student enrollment in SC public schools to MIS2000 records to ensure student information is current; and COE verification with random samples conducted during reinterviews.

Written procedures to ensure that childcount data are inputted and updated promptly throughout the year to ensure accuracy are communicated in:

? The Migrant Program Application:

- o p5 under LEA/LOA assurances which is signed by the authorized agent/certifying official for the LEA/LOA bullets four and six respectively: "provide data to the SEA as required for needs assessments, evaluation and reporting purposes;" "facilitate enrollment and provide data to receiving schools in the regular school year, such that migrant children resident thereafter are identified in the state data system for assessment purposes and for eligibility for categorical free meal services during the period of migrant eligibility."
- o p13 under Program Evaluation section I "Describe how priority children were identified and received priority service. For data reporting purposes, please attach a list of the identified priority for service (PFS) children served within the summer program activity, with full name, date of birth and grade level (using summer program classes as an extension of the regular school year just concluded)" (bold and underline in original).
- o p 13 under Program Evaluation section II "Provide the measureable outcomes results for Reading and Math assessments of achievement for identified priority children. Include discussion of achievement data based upon pre/post testing in Reading and Math and any ESOL service provided" (bold in original).
- o p 13 under Program Evaluation section III "Provide the measurable outcome results for Reading and Math assessments of achievement for all other summer program participants. Include discussion of achievement data bases

upon pre/post

testing in Reading and Math and any ESOL service provided" (bold in original).

o p 14 under Program Evaluation section VII "All original Certificates of Eligibility have (check all that apply): been provided for state review and approval; had data input and uploaded to the state database."

o p 19 Key strategy 4-4 of the CNA/SDP "Complete COEs and upload to MIS2000 and MSIX promptly; complete Consortium

OSY Tracking Forms profiling OSY and detailing the services

provided." o p 19 Key strategy 4-16 "Participate in data collection..."

o Appendix B "The Measurable Program Objective is aligned with a suggested method for collecting/reporting data for program evaluation. Owing to program differences by district, surveys must be composed by the district to reflect the district program activity."

? The Memorandum attached to the Categorical Eligibility letter:

o "Please share the enclosed list with appropriate school district personnel so that identified migrant children enrolled in the district are input with migrant status in PowerSchool and are provided free meal service. If a student on the list is not enrolled, there is no necessary action for that student."

o "The school district must use the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) to identify any migrant children not on this list, retain a COE copy and forward the original to Jennifer Almeda, Migrant Education Program, Rutledge Building, Suite 504-C, 1429 Senate Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201. Please use the COE which may be found at <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/accountability/federal-and-state-accountability/migrantprogram.html>. The fully completed COE must be reviewed and approved before the student is determined eligible. An updated list to include any addition during the school year will be provided to the district. Eligible migrant students on the list have categorical eligibility for the entire school year, even if migrant status ends within the current school year."

? On the Categorical Eligibility report sent at the beginning of the school year to Title I administrators:

o "PowerSchool data must include migrant status for enrolled migrant students. Enrollment of eligible migrant students must be confirmed within the school district with a Certificate of Eligibility (COE)."

o These students were identified in your area. Please verify if they are enrolled in your district. If they are, please ensure that they are checked as Migrant in PowerSchool."

o "Migrant students not yet identified may be present in the school district. When the school district identifies eligible migrant students by COE, the original COE must be provided to the South Carolina Migrant Education Program immediately. The COE and other related information may be downloaded from the Migrant Program page within the Department's web site (<http://ed.sc.gov>)."

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.

Concluding actions executed by State staff to authenticate accuracy of child counts produced by MIS2000 for the Category

1 and Category 2 submission to ED are as follows. The State Data manager reviews one by one each original paper COE to the data input into MIS2000. Attendance rosters, documentation of services, OSY tracking forms, and records of priority for services, are also corroborated as being correctly inputted into the MIS2000. Reports are then queried in MIS2000 for Category 1 and 2 Counts to crosscheck data elements such as spellings of last names, first names, parental information, date of birth, place of birth, etc. to eliminate any potential duplication. Any duplicated student information is merged onto one student record in MIS2000. MSIX is also employed to reference student information and constant resolution of worklists ensures that information is current. Any issues that have been found with the reporting of data on the original COE and/or MIS2000 are noted to be included in professional development and technical assistance to LEA staff.

The State Director (called Coordinator in SC) is active throughout the reporting process in order to update, review and to ensure accuracy of Category 1 and Category 2 child counts. Activities include: comparing the counts throughout the year to previous years in order to plan and adjust efforts during the year; reviewing MSIX worklist items; frequently verifying and reviewing data inputted into MIS2000 and on original COEs; ensuring collaboration and information exchange on students with Migrant Health, East Coast Migrant Head Start; communicating by personal visits, telephone calls, and emails the status and progress of migrant children in school districts; coordination with Title III and McKinney-Vento Homeless Programs at the State level; providing one on one technical assistance and monitoring to LEAs; etc. The final step before submission to ED is the review by the State Coordinator of the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Vigilance of the reliability and validity of eligibility determinations is of utmost importance to SCMEP evidenced by continual training of State level and local staff. Collectively, all SCMEP State and local team members receive training in March before the onset of peak summer season. Lead State recruiters are active in the SOSY consortium and receive training and professional development from the consortium which they share with local staff members. The veteran State recruiters also provide on the ground training and technical assistance to LEAs; for the summer 2012 program they conducted training/technical assistance to individual LEAs on ten separate occasions.

In 2011 SC completed the third year of the reinterview cycle which required external verification. SC coupled with NCMEP. The trained NC recruiters were able to reinterview a total of 52 students with a 0% defect rate; that is, all migrants reinterviewed qualified, however there were some minor errors found, such as a birthdate being a month off, or a different birth city in Mexico mentioned. And in the summer of 2012 a total of 107 prospective re-interviews done random samples were completed with no defect rate. There were as in 2011, some minor errors which were immediately corrected such as an inverted last name (the second last name put as the first last name), a birthdate off by a month, a different town in Florida mentioned than what was originally recorded as the student migrating from, and a Mexican State, listed as a birth city.

Although there have not been any defect rates for the past two seasons, SCMEP will continue its vigorous training of State and LEA staff to improve upon the minor errors found such as verifying the correct birth city, birth date, and exact city migrated the student migrated from.

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.

Currently there are no concerns regarding the accuracy of eligibility determinations or reported child counts, nonetheless, SCMEP will not slack on its vigilance to uphold its standards, especially through continuing ongoing professional development and technical assistance.