

# **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**

**VERMONT**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*  
Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2011-12 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

|   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
|   | OMB Number: 1810-0614       |
|   | Expiration Date: 11/30/2013 |
| <p>Consolidated State Performance Report<br/>For<br/>State Formula Grant Programs<br/>under the<br/>Elementary And Secondary Education Act<br/>as amended in 2001</p> |                             |
| Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12          |                             |
| Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:<br>Vermont Department of Education   |                             |
| Address:<br>120 State Street<br>Montpelier, VT  |                             |
| Person to contact about this report:  |                             |
| Name: Deborah Quackenbush   |                             |
| Telephone: 802-828-5877   |                             |
| Fax: 802-828-0573   |                             |
| e-mail: deb.quackenbush@state.vt.us   |                             |
| Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):<br>Deborah Quackenbush   |                             |
| _____<br>Signature  |                             |
| _____<br>Friday, March 8, 2013, 10:45:19 AM   |                             |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

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

|                            |                             |                             |                           |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                            | Mathematics                 | Reading/Language Arts       | Science                   |
| Academic Content Standards | Common Core State Standards | Common Core State Standards | Vermont Science Standards |

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

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

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

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

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

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  | New England Common Asses. Pro. | ew England Common Asses. Pro. | ew England Common Asses. Pro. |
| Regular Assessments in High School   | ew England Common Asses. Pro.  | ew England Common Asses. Pro. | ew England Common Asses. Pro. |
| 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                   | VT Alternate Assessment Pro.   | VT Alternate Assessment Pro.  | VT Alternate Assessment Pro.  |

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

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

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

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

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| No Revisions or changes | 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  | New England Common Assess. Pro | New England Common Assess. Pro | New England Common Assess. Pro |
| Regular Assessments in High School   |                                |                                |                                |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable) |                                |                                |                                |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)    |                                |                                |                                |
| Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards                   | VT ALT                         | VT ALT                         | VT ALT                         |

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

### 1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

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

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

| Purpose  | Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent) |
|--|---|
| To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)   | 25.00   |
| 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 | 75.00   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  |   |

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

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

| Purpose   | Used for Purpose (yes/no) |
|---|---------------------------|
| Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)   | Yes                       |
| Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)   | 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  | Yes                       |
| Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments   | Yes                       |
| Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time | No                        |
| Other   | No                        |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.   |                           |

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

| Student Group   | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students  | S                   | 43,662                   | 98                                   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S                   | 200                      | >=98                                 |
| Asian   | S                   | 732                      | >=99                                 |
| Black or African American                                     | S                   | 863                      | >=99                                 |
| Hispanic or Latino  | S                   | 583                      | >=99                                 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S                   | 34                       | >=90                                 |
| White   | S                   | 40,307                   | 98                                   |
| Two or more races   | S                   | 943                      | >=99                                 |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | S                   | 6,160                    | 97                                   |
| Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students            | S                   | 788                      | >=99                                 |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | S                   | 16,829                   | 98                                   |
| Migratory students  | S                   | 66                       | >=95                                 |
| Male  | S                   | 22,483                   | 98                                   |
| Female  | S                   | 21,179                   | 98                                   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |                     |                          |                                      |

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

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

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

| Type of Assessment  | # Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations                       | 1,612  | 26.17   |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations                          | 4,149  | 67.35   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards |  |   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards    |  |   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards   | 399  | 6.48  |
| Total   | 6,160  | ////////////////////////////////////  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.   |  |   |

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

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

| Student Group                              | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students                               | S                   | 44,132                   | >=99                                 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native           | S                   | 201                      | >=98                                 |
| Asian                                      | S                   | 706                      | >=99                                 |
| Black or African American                  | S                   | 864                      | >=99                                 |
| Hispanic or Latino                         | S                   | 581                      | >=99                                 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander  | S                   | 35                       | >=90                                 |
| White                                      | S                   | 40,802                   | >=99                                 |
| Two or more races                          | S                   | 943                      | >=99                                 |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) | S                   | 6,254                    | 98                                   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students  | S                   | 766                      | >=99                                 |
| Economically disadvantaged students        | S                   | 17,038                   | >=99                                 |
| Migratory students                         | S                   | 67                       | >=95                                 |
| Male                                       | S                   | 22,725                   | >=99                                 |
| Female                                     | S                   | 21,407                   | >=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 | 48 |
|--|----|

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

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

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

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

| Type of Assessment  | # Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations                       | 1,690  | 27.02   |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations                          | 4,164  | 66.58   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards |  |   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards    |  |   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards   | 400  | 6.40  |
| LEP < 12 months, took ELP                                       |  |   |
| Total   | 6,254  | ////////////////////  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.   |  |   |

**1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment**

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

| Student Group                             | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students                              | S                   | 19,073                   | >=99                                 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | S                   | 57                       | >=95                                 |
| Asian                                     | S                   | 328                      | >=99                                 |
| Black or African American                 | S                   | 363                      | >=99                                 |
| Hispanic or Latino                        | S                   | 243                      | >=98                                 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | S                   | 16                       | >=80                                 |
| White                                     | S                   | 17,645                   | >=99                                 |
| Two or more races                         | S                   | 421                      | 88                                   |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | S                   | 2,698                    | 98                                   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | S                   | 237                      | >=98                                 |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | S                   | 7,083                    | 98                                   |
| Migratory students                        | S                   | 21                       | >=90                                 |
| Male                                      | S                   | 9,731                    | >=99                                 |
| Female                                    | S                   | 9,342                    | >=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                       | 773   | 28.65  |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations                          | 1,834   | 67.98  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards |   |  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards    |   |  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards   | 91  | 3.37   |
| Total   | 2,698   | ////////////////////////////////////   |

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

| <b>Grade 3</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 5,993  | S  | 66   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 109  | S  | 63   |
| Black or African American                                     | 120  | S  | 32   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 78   | S  | 47   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,491  | S  | 67   |
| Two or more races   | 161  | S  | 61   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 674  | S  | 30   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 173  | S  | 43   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,510  | S  | 52   |
| Migratory students  | 13   | S  | 46   |
| Male  | 3,116  | S  | 64   |
| Female  | 2,877  | S  | 67   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 3</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,059  | S  | 72   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 102  | S  | 65   |
| Black or African American                                     | 119  | S  | 45   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 78   | S  | 58   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,564  | S  | 73   |
| Two or more races   | 161  | S  | 70   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 683  | S  | 28   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 168  | S  | 49   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,547  | S  | 61   |
| Migratory students  | 13   | S  | 38   |
| Male  | 3,157  | S  | 66   |
| Female  | 2,902  | S  | 79   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

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

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

| <b>Grade 4</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,006  | S  | 69   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 108  | S  | 72   |
| Black or African American                                     | 102  | S  | 43   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 85   | S  | 75   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,544  | S  | 70   |
| Two or more races   | 143  | S  | 56   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 790  | S  | 27   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 139  | S  | 48   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,520  | S  | 56   |
| Migratory students  | 10   | S  | 40   |
| Male  | 3,041  | S  | 68   |
| Female  | 2,965  | S  | 70   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 4</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,044  | S  | 71   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 105  | S  | 66   |
| Black or African American                                     | 102  | S  | 54   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 84   | S  | 67   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,585  | S  | 72   |
| Two or more races   | 144  | S  | 68   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 802  | S  | 21   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 137  | S  | 47   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,538  | S  | 57   |
| Migratory students  | 10   | S  | 40   |
| Male  | 3,061  | S  | 65   |
| Female  | 2,983  | S  | 77   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 4</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,114  | S  | 52   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 105  | S  | 49   |
| Black or African American                                     | 105  | S  | 27   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 85   | S  | 52   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,647  | S  | 53   |
| Two or more races   | 147  | S  | 42   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 935  | S  | 19   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 72   | S  | 17   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,642  | S  | 36   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,094  | S  | 51   |
| Female  | 3,020  | S  | 53   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 5</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,130  | S  | 65   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 106  | S  | 72   |
| Black or African American                                     | 136  | S  | 36   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 79   | S  | 58   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,627  | S  | 67   |
| Two or more races   | 137  | S  | 58   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 921  | S  | 26   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 116  | S  | 30   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,576  | S  | 52   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,159  | S  | 65   |
| Female  | 2,971  | S  | 66   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

**1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

| <b>Grade 5</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,188  | S  | 69   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 102  | S  | 75   |
| Black or African American                                     | 136  | S  | 50   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 80   | S  | 66   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,687  | S  | 70   |
| Two or more races   | 137  | S  | 65   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 935  | S  | 22   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 111  | S  | 28   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,602  | S  | 56   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,189  | S  | 64   |
| Female  | 2,999  | S  | 75   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 5</b>   | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students   |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native   |  |  |  |
| Asian  |  |  |  |
| Black or African American  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino   |  |  |  |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander  |  |  |  |
| White  |  |  |  |
| Two or more races  |  |  |  |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )   |  |  |  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students  |  |  |  |
| Economically disadvantaged students  |  |  |  |
| Migratory students   |  |  |  |
| Male   |  |  |  |
| Female   |  |  |  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not tested at grade 5 |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 6</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,179  | S  | 67   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 93   | S  | 82   |
| Black or African American                                     | 121  | S  | 34   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 99   | S  | 57   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,711  | S  | 67   |
| Two or more races   | 119  | S  | 65   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 980  | S  | 22   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 89   | S  | 24   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,473  | S  | 49   |
| Migratory students  | 11   | S  | 45   |
| Male  | 3,205  | S  | 66   |
| Female  | 2,974  | S  | 67   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 6</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,248  | S  | 75   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 91   | S  | 81   |
| Black or African American                                     | 118  | S  | 56   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 97   | S  | 72   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,787  | S  | 75   |
| Two or more races   | 119  | S  | 65   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 994  | S  | 26   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 84   | S  | 33   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,500  | S  | 61   |
| Migratory students  | 12   | S  | 50   |
| Male  | 3,243  | S  | 69   |
| Female  | 3,005  | S  | 81   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

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

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

| <b>Grade 7</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,385  | S  | 63   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 91   | S  | 79   |
| Black or African American                                     | 134  | S  | 31   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 83   | S  | 53   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,909  | S  | 64   |
| Two or more races   | 124  | S  | 48   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 970  | S  | 16   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 71   | S  | 13   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,440  | S  | 44   |
| Migratory students  | 11   | S  | 18   |
| Male  | 3,303  | S  | 62   |
| Female  | 3,082  | S  | 63   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 7</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,379  | S  | 73   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 90   | S  | 87   |
| Black or African American                                     | 133  | S  | 53   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 82   | S  | 73   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,906  | S  | 74   |
| Two or more races   | 124  | S  | 68   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 968  | S  | 23   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 69   | S  | 28   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,435  | S  | 58   |
| Migratory students  | 11   | S  | 27   |
| Male  | 3,299  | S  | 68   |
| Female  | 3,080  | S  | 79   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

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

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

| <b>Grade 8</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,506  | S  | 63   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 114  | S  | 64   |
| Black or African American                                     | 110  | S  | 30   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 87   | S  | 61   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 6,031  | S  | 64   |
| Two or more races   | 141  | S  | 42   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 1,002  | S  | 13   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 93   | S  | 14   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,413  | S  | 46   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,332  | S  | 61   |
| Female  | 3,174  | S  | 64   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 8</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,505  | S  | 79   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | 63   |
| Asian   | 107  | S  | 79   |
| Black or African American                                     | 110  | S  | 60   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 87   | S  | 82   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 6,038  | S  | 80   |
| Two or more races   | 140  | S  | 66   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 1,005  | S  | 34   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 89   | S  | 29   |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,415  | S  | 66   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,337  | S  | 75   |
| Female  | 3,168  | S  | 83   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>Grade 8</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,478  | S  | 30   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 114  | S  | 37   |
| Black or African American                                     | 117  | S  | 13   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 87   | S  | 24   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,988  | S  | 31   |
| Two or more races   | 149  | S  | 16   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 991  | S  | 3  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 84   | S  | <=5  |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,497  | S  | 16   |
| Migratory students  | 11   | S  | <20  |
| Male  | 3,316  | S  | 31   |
| Female  | 3,162  | S  | 29   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>High School</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,463  | S  | 36   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 111  | S  | 52   |
| Black or African American                                     | 140  | S  | 10   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 72   | S  | 24   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 5,994  | S  | 37   |
| Two or more races   | 118  | S  | 25   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 823  | S  | 3  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 107  | S  | 8  |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 1,897  | S  | 19   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,327  | S  | 37   |
| Female  | 3,136  | S  | 35   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

| <b>High School</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,709  | S  | 72   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 109  | S  | 67   |
| Black or African American                                     | 146  | S  | 47   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 73   | S  | 71   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 6,235  | S  | 73   |
| Two or more races   | 118  | S  | 64   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 867  | S  | 22   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 108  | S  | 9  |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 2,001  | S  | 55   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,439  | S  | 66   |
| Female  | 3,270  | S  | 79   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

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

| <b>High School</b>  | <b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students  | 6,481  | S  | 32   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                              | S  | S  | N<   |
| Asian   | 109  | S  | 38   |
| Black or African American                                     | 141  | S  | 11   |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 71   | S  | 28   |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander                     | S  | S  | N<   |
| White   | 6,010  | S  | 33   |
| Two or more races   | 125  | S  | 26   |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 772  | S  | <=2  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students                     | 81   | S  | 6  |
| Economically disadvantaged students                           | 1,944  | S  | 15   |
| Migratory students  | S  | S  | N<   |
| Male  | 3,321  | S  | 32   |
| Female  | 3,160  | S  | 33   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |  |

## 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   | 304     | 82                                  | 26.97                                  |
| Districts | 235     | 69                                  | 29.36                                  |

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

### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

| Title I School                            | # Title I Schools | # Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12 | Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12 |
|---|-------------------|---|---|
| All Title I schools                       | 236               | 60  | 25.42   |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools          | 187               | 41  | 21.93   |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 49                | 19  | 38.78   |

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

### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12 | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12 |
|---|--|--|
| 191   | 52   | 27.23  |

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

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

| <b>Corrective Action</b>  | <b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b> |
|---|---|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 12  |
| Extension of the school year or school day  | 2   |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance               | 0   |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level                    | 3   |
| Replacement of the principal  | 0   |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school                               | 9   |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school                               | 2   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.                       |   |

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

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

| <b>Restructuring Action</b>  | <b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b> |
|--|---|
| Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) |   |
| 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                               | 12  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.                    |   |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All the schools participated in a data-driven decision making process that resulted in restructuring plans that included a new or expanded structure of collaborative groups to implement changes in schedules, student support and instructional practices.

**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.

Because of the definition of district for accountability purposes as the town or union school district, in the majority of cases, the identified district is the same as the identified school, so we work through the identified school consequences.

For those districts with multiple school buildings, we have two types of identified districts: those that have identified schools and those that do not. In those that have identified schools we focus our work on the schools but work with the district for populations not identified at the school level. We provide technical assistance directly to the schools to help them effectively carry out the specific required actions in place depending on their level of identification. We also work with district leadership to assure they are addressing the needs of any identified subgroups in schools within the district that are not identified but whose performance contributed to the identification of the district.

To meet the Required Actions schools must develop a system of progress monitoring to assure that students who are struggling are identified early and provided appropriate support. The impact of the supports must also be assessed and adjusted as needed.

For districts that do not have identified schools, we work with the district leadership to assure that they are working with schools through the development and implementation of school improvement plans to address the content areas and subgroups that caused the district to be identified.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

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

| <b>Corrective Action</b>   | <b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b> |
|--|---|
| Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards  | 12  |
| Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district                                     | 0   |
| Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds  | 0   |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP  | 0   |
| Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district  | 0   |
| Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district  | 2   |
| Restructured the district  | 9   |
| Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action) | 0   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  |   |

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

| <b>Entity</b>   | <b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b> | <b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b> |
|---|--|--|
| Districts   |  |  |
| Schools   | 1  | 0  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |  |  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete | 09/20/11 |
|---|----------|

**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.

Training and support for school-based improvement coaches; training in use of Indistar, a planning monitoring and evaluation tool; and training in coaching methods and best practices for professional learning for adults

**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.

Our school support coordinators who work with all identified schools are partially supported by state funds. Through our partnership with the Vermont Student Assistance Program (VSAC) in a Gear-Up grant, we are able to provide some funding to non-Title I schools with middle or high school grades to implement schoolwide improvement strategies targeted at the reasons they were identified.

## 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

#### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

| <b>Public School Choice</b>   | <b># Students</b> |
|---|-------------------|
| Eligible for public school choice   | 1,238             |
| Applied to transfer   | 14                |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 10                |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.                   |                   |

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

| <b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>                   | <b>Amount</b> |
|--|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | \$ 41,544     |

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

| <b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b> | <b># LEAs</b> |
|---|---------------|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice   | 93            |

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

| <b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>                      | <b># Students</b> |
|---|-------------------|
| Eligible for supplemental educational services                | 12,600            |
| Applied for supplemental educational services                 | 1,311             |
| Received supplemental educational services                    | 819               |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |                   |

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

| <b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>          | <b>Amount</b> |
|---|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services    | \$ 1,134,465  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |               |

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

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

|                        | <b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b> | <b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b> | <b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b> | <b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b> | <b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b> |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| All classes            | 19,382   | 18,707   | 96.52  | 675   | 3.48  |
| All elementary classes | 4,594  | 4,470  | 97.30  | 124   | 2.70  |
| All secondary classes  | 14,788   | 14,237   | 96.27  | 551   | 3.73  |

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

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

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

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**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.

| <b>Elementary School Classes</b>   | <b>Percentage</b> |
|--|-------------------|
| 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 | 67.90             |
| 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               | 20.90             |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)  | 11.20             |
| Other (please explain in comment box below)  | 0.00              |
| Total  | 100.00            |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

| <b>Secondary School Classes</b>  | <b>Percentage</b> |
|--|-------------------|
| 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) | 82.10             |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects                              | 10.40             |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)   | 7.50              |
| 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 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Elementary Schools</b>       |   |   |   |
| High Poverty Elementary Schools | 1,867                                   | 1,793   | 96.04   |
| Low-poverty Elementary Schools  | 1,802                                   | 1,730   | 96.00   |
| <b>Secondary Schools</b>        |   |   |   |
| High Poverty secondary Schools  | 2,334                                   | 2,237   | 95.84   |
| Low-Poverty secondary Schools   | 3,233                                   | 3,128   | 96.75   |

#### 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<br>(more than what %)     | Low-Poverty Schools<br>(less than what %) |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Elementary schools  | 53.20  | 31.60                                     |
| Poverty metric used | Free or Reduced Meals used for Poverty metric. |   |
| Secondary schools   | 53.50  | 30.60                                     |
| Poverty metric used | Free or Reduced Meals used for Poverty metric. |   |

**FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty**

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other programs include: Push-In ESL; Newcomer Program; ELD Self-Contained Class.

**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                       | 1,573 |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |       |

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

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

| LEP Students Receiving Services  | #     |
|--|-------|
| LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year. | 1,230 |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  |       |

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

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

| Language           | # LEP Students |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Nepali             | 183            |
| Spanish; Castilian | 172            |
| Cushitic (Other)   | 166            |
| Chinese            | 113            |
| French             | 88             |

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   | 1,507 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment   | 28    |
| Total  | 1,535 |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Of the 28 students counted as "Not Tested", 10 actually have Significant Cognitive Disabilities and took the pilot of the ALTERNATE ACCESS test (instead of the ACCESS for ELLs) in Spring 2012. We don't yet know what the score equivalents would be to the ACCESS for ELLs test. The remaining 18 students were not tested for various reasons including being absent during the test window, refusing the assessment, or other students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities considered non-verbal or unable to test by their Special Education IEP Team. |       |

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

| All LEP Results  | #     |
|--|-------|
| Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment   | 290   |
| Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment  | 19.24 |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 290 students who attained proficiency equal 19.24% of the 1,507 students tested and 18.89% of the 1,536 students, including the students not tested. |       |

### 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  | 1,184 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment  | 21    |
| Total   | 1,205 |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Of the 21 Title III students "Not Tested", 7 have Significant Cognitive Disabilities and took the pilot of the ALTERNATE ACCESS test (instead of the ACCESS for ELLs) in Spring 2012. We don't yet know what the score equivalents would be to the ACCESS for ELLs test. The remaining 14 students were not tested for various reasons including being absent during the test window, refusing the assessment, or other students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities considered non-verbal or unable to test by their Special Education IEP Team. |       |

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. | 278 |

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

| Title III Results  | Results<br># | Results<br>% | Targets<br># | Targets<br>% |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Making progress  | 534          | 58.94        | 488          | 54.50        |
| Attained proficiency   | 206          | 17.40        | 93           | 8.00         |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The targets and data reported here are based on VT's approved AMAO Amendment and correlate to the 2012 testing year. The 2012 AMAO 1 & 2 targets will be used to determine whether students taking the Spring ACCESS 2012 meet AMAO 1 & 2. This results from the 2012 ACCESS testing are used to make the 2013 AMAO decisions in spring 2013. The 2012 AMAO data reported in section 1.6.4 is based on targets and assessment data from Spring 2011 ACCESS testing and Fall 2011 NECAP testing. This is done to ensure that the AMAO Determinations for language and academic testing are based on the same teaching year. |              |              |              |              |

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

|   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).                   | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).                             | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Vermont does not offer native language assessments. |                             |

**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)   |
|---|
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Vermont does not offer native language assessments. |

**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)   |
|---|
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Vermont does not offer native language assessments. |

**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)   |
|---|
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| -   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Vermont does not offer native language assessments. |

**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 |
|------------|------------|-------|
| 180        | 220        | 400   |

**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 |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 308      | S                        | 60        | S                  |

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Math assessment was administered in fall 2011 and reflects learning from 2010-2011 school year.

**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 |
|--|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 308  | S                        | 78        | S                  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Reading assessment was administered in fall 2011 and reflects learning from the 2010-2011 school year. |                          |           |                    |

**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 |
|--|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 127  | S                        | 32        | S                  |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science assessment was administered in spring 2012 and reflects learning from 2011-2012 and prior school years. The test is only given to students in grades 4,8,and 11. |                          |           |                    |

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

| <b>Title III Subgrantees</b>  | <b>#</b> |
|---|----------|
| # - Total number of subgrantees for the year  | 11       |
| ////////////////////////////////////  |          |
| # - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs  | 7        |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1  | 8        |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2  | 11       |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3  | 8        |
| ////////////////////////////////////  |          |
| # - 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) | 2        |

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 2012 AMAO Determinations are based on the Spring 2011 ACCESS and Fall 2011 NECAP testing, as per Anthony Masucci message dated January 21, 2010.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs   | _____ No |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. State did not meet AMAO 3. |          |

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

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

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

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

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

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

##### Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 572                           | 353                              | 0                         |

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.

Due to the fact that zero LEAs in Vermont met the state's definition of "significant increase", The VT DOE did not award any new Immigrant grants with 2011-2012 Title III funds in the 2011-2012 school year, because none of the LEAs met the state's definition of "significant increase." The \$32,500 that would have been set aside for Immigrant grants was instead included in the overall grant allocations for all eligible LEAs in 2011-2012. However, two Immigrant grants were awarded during the 2011-2012 school year that were associated with 2010-2011 funds.

## 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.  | 79 |
| Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 30 |

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.

Due to a delay in the hiring of new Educator Quality staff caused by HR complications the data for the C063, C064 & C067 files are not ready & can't be submitted by the deadline. Vermont will be submitting these files by Feb. 28, 2012 or sooner if possible. The data will be available by the reopen period of The CSPR Part I and will populate the CSPR at that time.

\* 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.

| <b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>  | <b># Subgrantees</b> | ////////////////////  |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students   | 10                   | ////////////////////  |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students                                    | 8                    | ////////////////////  |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 10                   | ////////////////////  |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards         | 7                    | ////////////////////  |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers   | 8                    | ////////////////////  |
| Other (Explain in comment box)  | 6                    | ////////////////////  |
| <b>Participant Information</b>  | <b># Subgrantees</b> | <b># Participants</b> |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers   | 10                   | 642                   |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers   | 10                   | 128                   |
| PD provided to principals   | 6                    | 33                    |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals   | 5                    | 13                    |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative  | 6                    | 181                   |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel   | 2                    | 9                     |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>39</b>            | <b>1,006</b>          |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other types of professional development activities conducted by subgrantees in 2011-2012 included: Presentation to Paraeducators on cultural backgrounds of ELLs;"ALL KIDS" Class: training in Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) for classroom teachers;Trauma Informed Training (related to refugee populations) for ELL Teachers, Social Workers, Guidance, and other educational personnel

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

| Date State Received Allocation   | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/\$\$ Distribution |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 07/01/11   | 10/01/11                            | 90                          |
| <p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Vermont Title III Program's grant period is October 1 September 30 rather than July 1- July 30. There are several reasons we chose to follow this schedule:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It allows us to use the results of the English language proficiency (ELP) assessments which arrive during the summer, providing the most up-to-date count of eligible students by district;</li> <li>2. LEAs have repeatedly said that they prefer submitting the Title III grant in the fall, when staff are back in school again and ready to plan and write the grants;</li> <li>3. It allows LEAs to plan and implement summer program activities well in advance (which would be difficult to do on the July 1 - June 30 schedule) and provides enough funding to carry them into the first month of school (and tide them over until the next round of Title III funding becomes available).</li> </ol> |                                     |                             |

### 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 LEAs actually don't go 90 days without access to Title III funds. The majority of districts plan according to the October 1 - September 30 schedule and spread their use of Title III funds out over the year.

The best way to shorten the period of distribution of Title III funds would be to speed up the State's process for electronic review of all grant documents.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

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

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

| <b>LEAs</b>   | <b>#</b> | <b># LEAs Reporting Data</b> |
|---|----------|------------------------------|
| LEAs without subgrants  | 57       | 57                           |
| LEAs with subgrants   | 4        | 4                            |
| Total   | 61       | 61                           |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |          |                              |

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

| <b>Age/Grade</b>                   | <b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b> | <b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b> |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 39  | 5  |
| K                                  | 83  | 22   |
| 1                                  | 96  | 15   |
| 2                                  | 101   | 22   |
| 3                                  | 73  | 12   |
| 4                                  | 74  | 14   |
| 5                                  | 91  | 13   |
| 6                                  | 66  | 16   |
| 7                                  | 62  | 12   |
| 8                                  | 61  | 19   |
| 9                                  | 44  | 18   |
| 10                                 | 50  | 19   |
| 11                                 | 60  | 21   |
| 12                                 | 78  | 16   |
| Ungraded                           |   |  |
| Total                              | 978   | 224  |

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1.9.1.1 Vermont does not have any ungraded homeless students, therefore, Ungraded in both columns is 0.

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

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

| <b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>  | <b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b> | <b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b> |
|---|--|---|
| Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care                                    | 73   | 21  |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)   | 621  | 135   |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 54   |   |
| Hotels/Motels   | 230  | 68  |
| Total   | 978  | 224   |

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1.9.1.2. In the second column, # of Homeless Children in LEAs with Subgrants, Unsheltered is 0.

**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.

| <b>Age/Grade</b>  | <b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b> |
|---|---|
| Age Birth Through 2   | 0   |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)                            | 20  |
| K   | 7   |
| 1   | 3   |
| 2   | 5   |
| 3   | 6   |
| 4   | 2   |
| 5   | 12  |
| 6   | 1   |
| 7   | 3   |
| 8   | 11  |
| 9   | 14  |
| 10  | 13  |
| 11  | 11  |
| 12  | 17  |
| Ungraded  | 19  |
| Total   | 144   |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |   |

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

| <b>Subgroup</b>   | <b># Homeless Students Served</b> |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Unaccompanied homeless youth                                  | 68                                |
| Migratory children/youth                                      | 2                                 |
| Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )                    | 29                                |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) students                     | 4                                 |
| <b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. |                                   |

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

| Grade       | # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient |
|-------------|--|--|
| 3           | 47   | 25   |
| 4           | 36   | 20   |
| 5           | 38   | 13   |
| 6           | 33   | 17   |
| 7           | 32   | 16   |
| 8           | 25   | 13   |
| High School | 23   | 10   |

**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           | 48   | 21   |
| 4           | 36   | 14   |
| 5           | 37   | 16   |
| 6           | 31   | 12   |
| 7           | 32   | 8  |
| 8           | 24   | 11   |
| High School | 23   | <=5  |

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

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

| Grade       | # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient |
|-------------|--|--|
| 3           |  |  |
| 4           | 77   | 18   |
| 5           |  |  |
| 6           |  |  |
| 7           |  |  |
| 8           | 59   | 4  |
| High School | 26   | <=5  |

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not tested at grades 3, 5, 6 or 7

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

| <b>Age/Grade</b>  | <b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b> |
|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)                            | 38   |
| K   | 15   |
| 1   | 19   |
| 2   | 24   |
| 3   | 22   |
| 4   | 11   |
| 5   | 12   |
| 6   | 18   |
| 7   | 11   |
| 8   | 12   |
| 9   | 8  |
| 10  | 13   |
| 11  | 5  |
| 12  | 2  |
| Ungraded  | 0  |
| Out-of-school   | 214  |
| Total   | 424  |
| <b>Comments:</b> 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.

change not greater than 10%.

**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).

| <b>Age/Grade</b>  | <b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b> |
|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)                            | 13   |
| K   | 7  |
| 1   | 6  |
| 2   | 7  |
| 3   | 10   |
| 4   | 3  |
| 5   | 5  |
| 6   | 7  |
| 7   | 3  |
| 8   | 5  |
| 9   | 3  |
| 10  | 1  |
| 11  | 1  |
| 12  | 0  |
| Ungraded  | 0  |
| Out-of-school   | 93   |
| Total   | 164  |
| <b>Comments:</b> 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.

12% decrease due to staffing changes in one area that left some previously served students unserved during the summer months.

**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.

1. Vermont uses MIS2000 to generate both category 1 & 2 counts.
2. Yes, Vermont has used the MIS2000 system for many years.

### 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.

1. Two sets of data are collected and inputted into the database: information from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and information from the performance reports from locally funded projects (both regular and summer terms). Vermont uses the mandated national COE form and collects the data on that form as well as the minimum data requirements of MSIX.

2. After a family with potentially eligible migrant students is identified, trained recruiters visit the family to determine their eligibility. A COE is completed and sent to the State's Identification & Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator for initial verification. The COEs are then given to the trained Data Specialist who compares the information to any past information on that family (including comparing student State ID number, student name, and both parents' names and information in MSIX) or student. Data such as birth dates and place of birth are doubly checked to ensure that migrant students that have changed names are not counted twice. The final verification is done by the State Director of Migrant Education who signs every COE. The data is then entered into the MIS2000 database. Information on the COEs is updated continually through the year as teachers and recruiters complete "Change" forms. If needed, updated COEs are completed. In addition, local projects and recruiters receive monthly lists of eligible students. They are asked to check those lists for accuracy and then send in any changes to the Data Specialist. Each year in November/December, the MEP does a residency verification by cross-checking the MEP database with the State's student demographic database. For every non-match (a student has left, switched schools, preschool students, and OSY not in the database, etc.) a recruiter does a face-to-face visit and completes an updated COE. The only exception is if we have already updated the COE within the preceding 30 days.

3. The data for this report was collected from 9/1/11 through 11/12 and covers the period 9/1/11 through 8/31/12. COEs are collected as completed throughout the year and performance reports are collected at the end of the regular term (June, 2012) and again at the end of the summer term (September, 2012). Procedures for Category 1 and 2 counts are collected and maintained exactly the same.

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.

All COEs and performance reports come in to one data specialist. The data is first reviewed for accuracy and completeness by both the ID&R Coordinator and by the Data Specialist and then again by the State Director of Migrant Education. The Data Specialist is the only one who inputs the data and in essence controls the database. The database is updated every time a student's situation changes - a move a change in grade leaving the state etc. Monthly reports are created and reviewed for accuracy at both the state and local level. Changes are made if and when the information is verified. The Child Count Report was designed according to OME's specifications by Management Services for Education Data in their MIS2000 system. Several test runs are done during the year to ensure that the Child Count information is accurately counting students. The Migrant Education database is separate but connected to the State's Student Demographic System and to the State's Education Data Warehouse. The State is able to cross-check information on migrant students. This enables us to verify the accuracy of information. The MEP database is still the only one in the State that records students who are in the state for only a short time.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same procedure is used. The summer session enrollment for the State's Category 2 count is reported at the end of summer (September, 2012). Local projects have up to 30 days after the end of the summer programming to submit in hard copy the summer student participation reports. When submitted, the State Director of Migrant Education approves the reports after clearing up any questions then the Data Specialist enters the information into the database.

### 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.

1. The Child Count is a report function of our MIS2000 system. It is designed to only count those students that are between 3 and 21 years of age and made a qualifying move within the past 3 years.
2. Students' towns of residency is a data field on the COE. Residency is annually verified by comparing the students in the Migrant Education database (MIS2000) with the State's Student Demographic database (which is updated each October and then revised when students move). A report is generated that confirms residency for students that are enrolled in school in Vermont. Another list is generated for students whose residency cannot be verified by the matching process. For those students recruiters go out and personally verify residency and update the COE. We do not include students in the Count whose residency is not verified. Students are counted only if they resided in the State for at least one day during the period 9/1/11 through 8/30/12.
3. Each funded local project reports the summer/intersession services each student receives in the summer Performance Report. Each year the local projects receive training on the definition of summer/intersession services. From those reports the Data Specialist enters the summer/intersession services each student receives into the MIS2000 database and a summer count report is created. The program only counts those students who receive summer services and are between 3 and 22 and have not yet received their high school diploma. It does not include students on an extended status - those whose LQM was more than 3 years before the start of the summer program.
4. Because only the Data Specialist enters the data she is able to verify that students are only entered once per Child Count category. All students in Vermont are given a non duplicative identification number in both the MIS2000 and Student Demographic databases. Before an identification number is issued to a student a number of checks are performed - are there any similarities between names, birthdays, parents or other indicating factors. This is done to insure that the same child is not entered twice. MIS2000 is programmed to only count students with separate identification numbers. Grades levels are crossed-checked with the student demographic database to ensure accuracy and students are only entered into the next grade after their status is verified.

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.

Category 2 count is generated using the same 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.

Accuracy checks are built into each step of the data process. The first step to guarantee accuracy is appropriate training for both recruiters and the Data Specialist. The State ID&R Coordinator trains all new recruiters using the national recruitment training manual and holds monthly meetings to talk about recruitment issues and to review eligibility criteria. All recruiters are trained using the training format suggested by the Office of Migrant Education, and the policy guidance. They all use the national COE and an interview checklist to ensure the accuracy of eligibility determinations. The interview checklist was recently updated to respond to findings from the State's monitoring review. The Data Specialist often attends the recruiter meetings. Occasionally the State Director of Migrant Education is asked to attend these meetings to clear up questions regarding eligibility. Quarterly, the State Director and the State Coordinator of ID&R formally meet to evaluate the effectiveness of the recruitment plan and agree on any needed changes, but many informal meetings, phone calls, and emails are conducted to talk through eligibility questions. Vermont supports recruiters' attendance at national trainings. Also the State ID&R Coordinator is responsible for annually updating the recruiters' handbook and it includes the latest OME guidance on recruitment. If there is any question regarding eligibility the State Director of Migrant Education makes the final decision. Vermont has supported attendance by both the ID&R Coordinator and recruiters at National Migrant Education Conferences.

Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. Often schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed, a recruiter or the State ID&R Coordinator is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list. Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy. In October, a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME. Several trial runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match. Finally the State has implemented a reinterview procedure to ensure the quality of our data. 20% of each month's COEs receive a reinterview. The manner is modeled after the procedure Vermont used in the triennial reinterview process and further refined by procedures outlined by OME in guidance and training documents. Every 3 years, an external reinterview process is done on a pre-determined number of COEs. Vermont last conducted this type of verification in school year 2010-11.

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.

#### Vermont Quality Control Plan & Re-Interview Plan

The Vermont Migrant Education Program (VMEP) seeks 100% accuracy in determining the eligibility of migrant children and youth. Vermont's Quality Control Plan is divided into three sections; Hiring, Training and Oversight of Staff, COE Inspection via an annual internal Rolling Re-interview process and an external Triennial Re-interview, a process which was conducted last year, in FY11. The VT Quality Control Plan was created by the UVM Extension MEP ID&R Coordinator and adopted by the State Dept. of Education in February 2005. After the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing was issued by OME in 2010, the VT Quality Control Plan was reviewed once again ensuring VT standards were in line with new guidance.

The primary strategy of VT's annual audit process is the re-interviewing of families and youth found eligible on a monthly basis throughout the funding year - prior to submitting our state child count numbers. The annual audit is an ongoing process rather than a snapshot in time. Given the nature of migratory families, trying to find and re-interview a family at a

much later date would be extremely difficult. Therefore, at the end of each month, 20% of all new COEs are examined and the families and youth are re-interviewed. Sample COEs are chosen randomly across all MEP statewide regions to ensure a geographic diversity. Families and youth are notified at the initial recruitment interview that follow-up interviews may be a possibility so as to set the stage for the re-interview process if they are selected. The primary re-interviewer is the State Coordinator of ID & R as this individual rarely completes original COE's. If a COE is selected which the ID&R Coordinator did conduct, a regional recruiter will do the re-interview to maintain a third party is involved. The re-interviewer follows a re-interview script and documents the results (See Attachment A - Child Eligibility Re-Interviewing). Results are reviewed and analyzed quarterly. Errors will be corrected and if need be, families and youth removed from the database, prior to the State of Vermont annual child count submission.

#### Results:

Approximately 17% of the Total 171 COE's completed by VT Recruitment staff were re-interviewed over FY12 by the ID&R Coordinator. 29 MEP enrolled students were re-interviewed between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012 and 0 students were found to be erroneously enrolled into the Vermont Migrant Education Program, equaling a 0% error rate for this reporting period.

By the time COE's reach certification by the State Director of the VMEP, they have gone through an intensive review process. COE's are conducted in person by all VT Recruitment Staff. Once completed they are reviewed by the State ID&R Coordinator, this process stops the certification process immediately if any information on the COE is incorrect, needs further explanation or requires additional information from the enrolling Recruiter. Because the ID&R Coordinator does not certify the COE's for VT, this process blocks many ineligible students from ever reaching the desk of the MEP State

Director for certification. This year, the ID&R Coordinator denied 15 COEs totaling what would be 34 students that Recruiters completed COE's for. These COE's did not make it through the VT Quality Control Process and were therefore never certified by the State Director or enrolled into the VMEP. It is this process which equates to such a low error rate for the VMEP. COE's, students and families are heavily screened and re-interviewed prior to certification by the State Director. Therefore, by the time a child is certified and fully enrolled into the program and 20% are selected for the prospective annual re-interview process, very few errors exist.

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.

Information is entered as COEs are done and at least weekly. Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. In some cases schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition, various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed, a recruiter or the State ID&R Coordinator is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list. Names of students are also cross-checked with the data in MSIX to identify any possible duplications. Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy.

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.

In October a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed (for both Category 1 & 2 counts) by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME/EDEN. Several runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match. Each time there is a question about the data's accuracy, the Data Specialist confers with our contact at MIS2000. The discrepancies are noted and occasionally tweaks to the programming need to be made. Tests are continued until both the MIS2000 staff and the Data Specialist are confident that the data is accurate. With less than 500 students each year, it is fairly easy to identify if the data is accurate.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has implemented a rigorous quality control plan. In addition through our participation in the national meetings and ID&R trainings, we have been able to review our procedures with those of other states and against best practices. In fact, our ID & R Coordinator has been hired by a number of other states to both coordinate or participate in their reinterview process. This has given us a unique view to other state's procedures and some of those we have adopted. We employ standardized forms and procedures. Each recruiter receives the same training, receives an annually updated ID&R training manual, and is shadowed by the Coordinator regularly. By improving our recruiting procedures and by continually re interviewing we will attain our goal of a 0% error rate.

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.

We have no concerns at present.