

**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 2012-13**

**GEORGIA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**

**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) 2012-13 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~~4~~, 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 200~~5~~6, 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 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2012-13 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2012-13		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Georgia Department of Education		
Address: 2066 Twin Towers East 205 Jesse Hill Jr. Drive SE		
		Person to contact about this report:
Name: Levette Williams		
Telephone: 404-463-6504		
Fax: 404-656-0978		
e-mail: lewillia@doe.k12.ga.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. John Barge		
		Wednesday, April 16, 2014, 2:04:00 PM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2012-13**



**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.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "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., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

In June 2010, the State Board of Education adopted the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards in language arts and mathematics. These content standards were implemented during the 2012-2013 school year. This adoption and implementation did not impact the science content standards.

**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.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic achievement 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 "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., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-2013 and 2013-2014	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Georgia will implement a new assessment system in language arts and mathematics in 2014-2015. New achievement standards will be established at that time. As Georgia has transitioned to the CCGPS in high school mathematics, new End of Course Tests have been developed to align to the new courses. Coordinate Algebra was implemented in the 2012-2013 school year and new achievement standards have been established. Analytic Geometry is being implemented in the 2013-2014 school year and new achievement standards will be implemented.

**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.

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-2013 and 2013-2014	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Georgia will implement a new assessment system in language arts and mathematics in 2014-2015. New achievement standards will be established at that time. As Georgia has transitioned to the CCGPS in high school mathematics, new End of Course Tests have been developed to align to the new courses. Coordinate Algebra was implemented in the 2012-2013 school year and new achievement standards have been established. Analytic Geometry is being implemented in the 2013-2014 school year and new achievement standards will be implemented.

**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 2012-13, 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)	50.00
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	50.00
<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 2012-13 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	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No Respons
<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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

**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	889,826	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,775	≥99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	945	≥99
Asian	S	31,787	99.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	328,327	99.2
Hispanic or Latino	S	112,472	99.6
White	S	387,185	99.7
Two or more races	S	27,335	99.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	106,214	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	53,673	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	S	525,533	99.4
Migratory students	S	1,964	≥99
Male	S	453,852	99.4
Female	S	435,974	99.6
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	20,196	19.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	53,416	50.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	22,804	21.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	9,798	9.2
Total	106,214	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data is reported accurately.		

**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	873,346	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,702	≥99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	911	≥99
<i>Asian</i>	S	31,440	99.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	S	321,824	99.5
Hispanic or Latino	S	110,472	99.5
White	S	380,192	99.7
Two or more races	S	26,805	99.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	104,486	99.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	52,590	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	S	514,895	99.5
Migratory students	S	1,936	≥99
Male	S	445,397	99.5
Female	S	427,949	99.6

**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 Assessments**

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 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	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	1,837

**1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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	20,259	19.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	56,277	53.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	18,132	17.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	9,798	9.4
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	20	S
Total	104,486	

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

**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	892,590	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,803	≥99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	940	≥99
Asian	S	31,718	99.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	329,929	99.2
Hispanic or Latino	S	113,460	99.5
White	S	387,305	99.6
Two or more races	S	27,435	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	107,679	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	54,123	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	S	529,813	99.4
Migratory students	S	1,959	≥99
Male	S	455,863	99.4
Female	S	436,727	99.6

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

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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	21,603	20.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	76,278	70.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	9,798	9.1
Total	107,679	

**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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for academic achievement data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

**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.

**1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months unless a state chooses to include these students. Do not include former LEP students.

**1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

## 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,124	S	78.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	S	79
Asian or Pacific Islander	119	S	71
Asian	4,831	S	92.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	45,463	S	67.2
Hispanic or Latino	18,131	S	75.8
White	55,028	S	86.2
Two or more races	4,282	S	80.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,870	S	56.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,004	S	74.0
Economically disadvantaged students	78,426	S	70.5
Migratory students	361	S	75
Male	65,424	S	76.3
Female	62,700	S	79.8
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	127,821	S	94.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	S	≥95
Asian or Pacific Islander	118	S	92
Asian	4,704	S	97.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	45,426	S	90.7
Hispanic or Latino	17,992	S	93.7
White	55,031	S	97.4
Two or more races	4,280	S	96.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,874	S	83.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,640	S	92.5
Economically disadvantaged students	78,208	S	92.0
Migratory students	356	S	91
Male	65,270	S	93.1
Female	62,551	S	95.9
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,042	S	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	269	S	80.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	119	S	81
Asian	4,833	S	89.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	45,428	S	65.6
Hispanic or Latino	18,122	S	75.2
White	54,991	S	89.1
Two or more races	4,280	S	83.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,853	S	59.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,997	S	71.8
Economically disadvantaged students	78,370	S	70.6
Migratory students	360	S	70
Male	65,379	S	76.7
Female	62,663	S	80.5
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,883	S	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	S	85
Asian or Pacific Islander	135	S	85
Asian	4,741	S	95.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	45,576	S	73.5
Hispanic or Latino	17,391	S	83.5
White	54,593	S	90.8
Two or more races	4,209	S	87.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,083	S	63.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,525	S	78.4
Economically disadvantaged students	76,853	S	77.3
Migratory students	302	S	78
Male	64,857	S	82.5
Female	62,026	S	84.8
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,561	S	91.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	S	94
Asian or Pacific Islander	135	S	91
Asian	4,631	S	96.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	45,542	S	86.8
Hispanic or Latino	17,229	S	90.1
White	54,582	S	95.6
Two or more races	4,204	S	94.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,093	S	74.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,167	S	85.9
Economically disadvantaged students	76,641	S	88.0
Migratory students	297	S	85
Male	64,692	S	90.1
Female	61,869	S	93.3
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,795	S	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	S	88
Asian or Pacific Islander	135	S	84
Asian	4,738	S	92.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	45,540	S	71.6
Hispanic or Latino	17,386	S	80.7
White	54,551	S	91.7
Two or more races	4,207	S	87.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16,072	S	61.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,521	S	73.8
Economically disadvantaged students	76,792	S	75.8
Migratory students	302	S	76
Male	64,804	S	82.5
Female	61,991	S	83.3
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,348	S	92.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	S	93
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	S	94
Asian	4,602	S	96.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	46,591	S	87.5
Hispanic or Latino	17,349	S	92.3
White	55,282	S	95.3
Two or more races	4,132	S	94.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,953	S	74.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,625	S	86.5
Economically disadvantaged students	77,911	S	88.8
Migratory students	300	S	90
Male	65,765	S	90.7
Female	62,583	S	93.6
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	127,989	S	96.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	250	S	≥95
Asian or Pacific Islander	138	S	≥95
Asian	4,465	S	96.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	46,553	S	93.7
Hispanic or Latino	17,199	S	95.2
White	55,257	S	98.1
Two or more races	4,127	S	97.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,950	S	85.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,267	S	89.9
Economically disadvantaged students	77,673	S	94.2
Migratory students	296	S	92
Male	65,588	S	95.0
Female	62,401	S	97.1
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,214	S	79.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	S	82
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	S	76
Asian	4,602	S	90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	46,543	S	68.9
Hispanic or Latino	17,339	S	74.6
White	55,212	S	89.4
Two or more races	4,126	S	84.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16,920	S	53.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,621	S	57.3
Economically disadvantaged students	77,824	S	71.9
Migratory students	300	S	63
Male	65,696	S	77.9
Female	62,518	S	81.8
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	129,171	S	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	S	83.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	129	S	82
Asian	4,532	S	94.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	48,253	S	71.9
Hispanic or Latino	16,799	S	81.6
White	55,259	S	88.9
Two or more races	3,982	S	84.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,784	S	54.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,359	S	67.0
Economically disadvantaged students	78,067	S	74.9
Migratory students	313	S	76
Male	66,090	S	79.3
Female	63,081	S	84.1
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,834	S	95.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	S	≥95
Asian or Pacific Islander	126	S	≥95
Asian	4,424	S	97.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	48,215	S	92.4
Hispanic or Latino	16,640	S	94.5
White	55,235	S	97.2
Two or more races	3,980	S	96.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,752	S	79.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,010	S	86.8
Economically disadvantaged students	77,827	S	93.0
Migratory students	306	S	89
Male	65,912	S	93.4
Female	62,922	S	96.7
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	129,050	S	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	S	80
Asian or Pacific Islander	129	S	71
<i>Asian</i>	4,532	S	90.1
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	48,211	S	59.7
Hispanic or Latino	16,791	S	72.2
White	55,192	S	86.1
Two or more races	3,979	S	80.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,771	S	46.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,355	S	51.2
Economically disadvantaged students	77,984	S	64.9
Migratory students	313	S	64
Male	66,025	S	75.0
Female	63,025	S	73.8
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,458	S	89.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	S	90
Asian or Pacific Islander	116	S	91
Asian	4,431	S	95.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	48,370	S	82.8
Hispanic or Latino	15,508	S	89.9
White	56,031	S	93.9
Two or more races	3,739	S	91.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,036	S	68.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,100	S	76.4
Economically disadvantaged students	76,310	S	85.0
Migratory students	259	S	88
Male	65,620	S	87.4
Female	62,838	S	91.2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,067	S	94.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	S	95
Asian or Pacific Islander	114	S	≥95
Asian	4,316	S	96.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	48,310	S	91.1
Hispanic or Latino	15,309	S	93.2
White	56,012	S	96.4
Two or more races	3,743	S	96.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,998	S	75.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,685	S	82.4
Economically disadvantaged students	76,013	S	91.6
Migratory students	255	S	91
Male	65,389	S	91.9
Female	62,678	S	96.2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128,318	S	85.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	S	84
Asian or Pacific Islander	116	S	93
Asian	4,428	S	93.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	48,296	S	77.4
Hispanic or Latino	15,493	S	84.4
White	55,982	S	91.9
Two or more races	3,740	S	89.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,009	S	56.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,098	S	65.4
Economically disadvantaged students	76,199	S	79.7
Migratory students	259	S	82
Male	65,532	S	83.9
Female	62,786	S	87.2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,371	S	87.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	S	90
Asian or Pacific Islander	143	S	87
Asian	4,223	S	95.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	47,210	S	81.0
Hispanic or Latino	14,574	S	87.9
White	56,261	S	92.9
Two or more races	3,695	S	90.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,502	S	68.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,974	S	72.7
Economically disadvantaged students	73,356	S	82.7
Migratory students	241	S	83
Male	64,340	S	86.3
Female	62,031	S	89.5
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,060	S	97.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	264	S	≥95
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	S	≥95
Asian	4,129	S	96.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	47,172	S	96.1
Hispanic or Latino	14,416	S	97.1
White	56,243	S	98.6
Two or more races	3,696	S	98.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,502	S	86.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,645	S	88.1
Economically disadvantaged students	73,140	S	96.2
Migratory students	235	S	94
Male	64,176	S	96.7
Female	61,884	S	98.2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,072	S	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	264	S	78
Asian or Pacific Islander	143	S	73
Asian	4,220	S	88.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	47,075	S	62.0
Hispanic or Latino	14,550	S	70.7
White	56,131	S	84.8
Two or more races	3,689	S	80.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,427	S	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,966	S	42.4
Economically disadvantaged students	73,132	S	65.1
Migratory students	241	S	56
Male	64,184	S	74.1
Female	61,888	S	75.1
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

## 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	122,471	S	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	S	67
Asian or Pacific Islander	163	S	67
Asian	4,427	S	87.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	46,864	S	52.9
Hispanic or Latino	12,720	S	64.6
White	54,731	S	77.2
Two or more races	3,296	S	72.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,986	4S	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,086	1S	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	64,610	3S	56.2
Migratory students	188	S	48
Male	61,756	S	64.6
Female	60,715	S	69.0

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia utilizes its End of Course Tests (EOCT) as its accountability measure at the high school level. The courses assessed in language arts and mathematics are required of all students per State Board Rule. Students must earn credit in the assessed courses in order to graduate. Due to the rigor of the high school mathematics courses, Georgia has more students having to repeat these courses at the high school level. All students enrolled in the course must take the EOCT, which serves as the final exam. This is why there are more students enrolled and participating in the Mathematics EOCT than the Language Arts EOCT.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	106,177	S	90.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	S	92
Asian or Pacific Islander	129	S	91
Asian	4,150	S	92.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	40,315	S	86.4
Hispanic or Latino	10,948	S	88.4
White	47,670	S	95.0
Two or more races	2,767	S	95
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,297	S	63.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,339	S	63
Economically disadvantaged students	54,119	S	86.5
Migratory students	166	S	80
Male	53,400	S	88.8
Female	52,777	S	93.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia utilizes its End of Course Tests (EOCT) as its accountability measure at the high school level. The courses assessed in language arts and mathematics are required of all students per State Board Rule. Students must earn credit in the assessed courses in order to graduate. Due to the rigor of the high school mathematics courses, Georgia has more students having to repeat these courses at the high school level. All students enrolled in the course must take the EOCT, which serves as the final exam. This is why there are more students enrolled and participating in the Mathematics EOCT than the Language Arts EOCT.

## 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,099	S	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	301	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	158	S	68
<i>Asian</i>	4,365	S	85.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	48,836	S	62.3
Hispanic or Latino	13,779	S	70.4
White	55,246	S	86.0
Two or more races	3,414	S	81.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,627	S	43.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,565	S	42.2
Economically disadvantaged students	69,512	S	65.2
Migratory students	184	S	56
Male	64,243	S	74.2
Female	61,856	S	75.6
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.4 CHARTER 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**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Schools			
Districts			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia has received waiver.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>3</sup> based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
Schools	2,264	340	15.02
Districts	198	7	3.54

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

<sup>3</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. 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 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia has received waiver.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator<sup>4</sup> based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools	1,563	114	7.29
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,490	105	7.05
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	73	9	12.33

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

<sup>4</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia has received waiver.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>5</sup> based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator
195	7	3.59

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

<sup>5</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As of March 30, 2012, Georgia was granted a waiver from No Child Left Behind (NCLB). No longer will Georgia be bound by the narrow definitions of success found in NCLB. The waiver enables the state to hold schools accountable and reward them for the work they do in all subjects and with all students. In order to receive the waiver, the U.S. Department of Education required that states identify Title I Priority Schools, Focus Schools, and Reward Schools. Achievement data from all core content areas and graduation rate data will be used to identify Priority and Focus Schools, which will replace the current Needs Improvement Schools designation. Reward Schools - which will be determined based on math, reading and English language arts results - will replace the current Title I Distinguished Schools designation. Georgia will also identify Alert Schools in three categories: Subgroup Alert Schools, Subject Alert Schools, and Graduation Alert Schools. These Alert Schools will be identified based on a more detailed evaluation of subgroup performance and include non-Title I schools.</p>	

**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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As of March 30, 2012, Georgia was granted a waiver from No Child Left Behind (NCLB). No longer will Georgia be bound by the narrow definitions of success found in NCLB. The waiver enables the state to hold schools accountable and reward them for the work they do in all subjects and with all students. In order to receive the waiver, the U.S. Department of Education required that states identify Title I Priority Schools, Focus Schools, and Reward Schools. Achievement data from all core content areas and graduation rate data will be used to identify Priority and Focus Schools, which will replace the current Needs Improvement Schools designation. Reward Schools - which will be determined based on math, reading and English language arts results - will replace the current Title I Distinguished Schools designation. Georgia will also identify Alert Schools in three categories: Subgroup Alert Schools, Subject Alert Schools, and Graduation Alert Schools. These Alert Schools will be identified based on a more detailed evaluation of subgroup performance and include non-Title I schools.</p>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As of March 30, 2012, Georgia was granted a waiver from No Child Left Behind (NCLB). No longer will Georgia be bound by the narrow definitions of success found in NCLB. The waiver enables the state to hold schools accountable and reward them for the work they do in all subjects and with all students.

In order to receive the waiver, the U.S. Department of Education required that states identify Title I Priority Schools, Focus Schools, and Reward Schools (details listed below). Achievement data from all core content areas and graduation rate data will be used to identify Priority and Focus Schools, which will replace the current Needs Improvement Schools designation. Reward Schools - which will be determined based on math, reading and English language arts results - will replace the current Title I Distinguished Schools designation. Georgia will also identify Alert Schools in three categories: Subgroup Alert Schools, Subject Alert Schools, and Graduation Alert Schools. These Alert Schools will be identified based on a more detailed evaluation of subgroup performance and include non-Title I schools.

The School Improvement Division provides a superior system of statewide support to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in Georgia to advance school improvement efforts that positively influence student learning.

The work of the School Improvement Division is to design and implement a coherent and sustained statewide system of support and process for improvement. In addition, the division provides districts and schools in Georgia with tools and resources, as well as intensive support and professional learning for all schools, including those with significant student achievement issues. The division also collaborates with other departments within the Georgia Department of Education and other external agencies such as the Regional Educational Service Agencies, the Georgia Learning Resources System, and colleges and universities to provide support for all Georgia schools and districts. The School Improvement Division works with SIG Priority Schools, Non-SIG Priority Schools, Focus Schools, Alert Schools, and Race to the Top Lowest Achieving Schools (RT3 LAS). Technical assistance is provided, and Title I Part A 1003 (a) School Improvement Grants are awarded to 65 Priority schools, 148 Focus schools, and 35 Alert schools in 82 LEA systems and two state schools.

The Title I, Part A, 1003(a) school improvement grants provide funds to local educational agencies on behalf of Title I schools identified as Alert, Focus, or Priority Schools. Schools utilize these formula funds to fund school improvement activities as listed in the school improvement plan. The school improvement plan is written based on the identified student needs of the Alert, Focus, or Priority School. The Title I, Part A, 1003(a) school improvement grants are allocated to local educational agencies to provide financial resources to Title I schools identified as Alert, Focus, or Priority. These funds support implementation of the identified schools' school improvement plans required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the ESEA Waiver approved by the United States Education Department on February 6, 2012.

Describe how the grant will be monitored to ensure satisfactory performance: Schools receiving Title I, Part A, Section 1003(a) are monitored by Lead School Improvement Specialists to ensure that program quality is maintained throughout the duration of the grant cycle. Additionally, budgets must be submitted through the LEA Consolidated Application and are approved by program staff in the School Improvement Division and the Georgia Department of Education Grants Accounting Division before LEAs are allowed to request reimbursement through the Grants Accounting Online Reporting System (GAORS). Fiscal monitoring occurs during the budget approval process and through cross-functional on-site monitoring visits. In addition, GaDOE and RESA school improvement specialists provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure that funds are spent in accordance with federal guidelines and targeted areas for growth.

Performance, criteria, and results: Progress is determined by schools meeting established federal programmatic and fiscal monitoring and reporting compliance criteria. Student achievement outcomes, via CCRPI scores, specifically achievement points and achievement gap points, inform targeted technical assistance to the LEAs on programming and use of funds. Performance data will be reviewed in Indistar? by the School Improvement Specialist. Quarterly analysis of implementation, expenditures, and use of data will be communicated with the school principal and LEA contact. Issues concerning compliance will be communicated to the LEA superintendent and if not resolved, the State Board of Education.

Performance Metrics: Each LEA reports on expenditures for each authorized activity for which funds were expended. Additionally, academic progress on annual performance is evaluated by RESA and GaDOE School Improvement Specialists in Indistar, an online performance management tool for school improvement.

**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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2011-12 and beginning of SY 2012-13 as a corrective action)	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As of March 30, 2012, Georgia was granted a waiver from No Child Left Behind (NCLB). No longer will Georgia be bound by the narrow definitions of success found in NCLB. The waiver enables the state to hold schools accountable and reward them for the work they do in all subjects and with all students. In order to receive the waiver, the U.S. Department of Education required that states identify Title I Priority Schools, Focus Schools, and Reward Schools. Achievement data from all core content areas and graduation rate data will be used to identify Priority and Focus Schools, which will replace the current Needs Improvement Schools designation. Reward Schools - which will be determined based on math, reading and English language arts results - will replace the current Title I Distinguished Schools designation. Georgia will also identify Alert Schools in three categories: Subgroup Alert Schools, Subject Alert Schools, and Graduation Alert Schools. These Alert Schools will be identified based on a more detailed evaluation of subgroup performance and include non-Title I schools.

**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 2012-13 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As of March 30, 2012, Georgia was granted a waiver from No Child Left Behind (NCLB). No longer will Georgia be bound by the narrow definitions of success found in NCLB. The waiver enables the state to hold schools accountable and reward them for the work they do in all subjects and with all students. In order to receive the waiver, the U.S. Department of Education required that states identify Title I Priority Schools, Focus Schools, and Reward Schools. Achievement data from all core content areas and graduation rate data will be used to identify Priority and Focus Schools, which will replace the current Needs Improvement Schools designation. Reward Schools - which will be determined based on math, reading and English language arts results - will replace the current Title I Distinguished Schools designation. Georgia will also identify Alert Schools in three categories: Subgroup Alert Schools, Subject Alert Schools, and Graduation Alert Schools. These Alert Schools will be identified based on a more detailed evaluation of subgroup performance and include non-Title I schools.

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete	

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA .

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.

1A.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2012 (SY 2012-13) 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

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**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) ~~and~~ technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2012-13.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The evaluation and technical assistance activities conducted during SY2012-13 included the provision of assigned school improvement specialists in each of the schools receiving 1003(g) funds. The school improvement specialists provided guidance and support in the implementation of their school improvement grant in order to meet assurances and identified targets. Professional development was provided for SIG coordinators, principals, instructional coaches, graduation coaches and school leadership teams. Further, professional learning opportunities were provided to the school improvement specialists to ensure quality in the delivery of the services and support to the schools. Quarterly monitoring and evaluation of the program initiatives of 1003(g) funded schools was conducted by lead school improvement specialists. An annual performance review was completed at the end of the school year to evaluate the progress for each of the schools. ~~SIG fiscal analysts provided ongoing technical assistance and both desktop and on-site monitoring related to the budgets of the 1003(g) funded schools.~~

**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 2012-13 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.

The State Board of Education (SBOE) maintains an approved Single Statewide Accountability System with awards and consequences. This system is described in detail in SBOE Rule 160-7-1.01. This and other Board rules related to federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requirements may be reviewed on the GaDOE website, <http://www.gadoe.org/>. In February 2012, the US Department of Education granted a waiver to Georgia to implement revised supports and rewards. The goal of the Office of School Improvement is to design and implement a coherent and sustained statewide system of support and process for improvement, providing local education agencies and schools in Georgia with tools and resources, as well as intensive support for identified as Priority Schools, Focus Schools, or Alert Schools. Schools identified through the waiver receive the support of a school improvement specialist. Priority Schools and Focus Schools engage in a Memorandum of Agreement with the GaDOE. The following are the nonnegotiable components in the MOA and all activities are supported by the assigned school improvement specialist:

- Directly involved in decisions regarding replacement of staff (e.g., principal).
- Ensures that instructional frameworks are used appropriately in each classroom.
- Ensures benchmark assessments are given and results are analyzed to guide instruction.
- Oversees implementation of short-term action plans.
- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes teacher attendance and develops action plan if needed.
- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes student attendance and develops action plan if needed.
- Ensures that the leadership team analyzes discipline records and develops action plan if needed.
- Participate in a GAPSS
- Ensures that the leadership team addresses targeted areas from the GAPSS review through the short-term action plans.
- Provide training, implementation and monitoring of school improvement strategies.

In addition to the set of non-negotiable actions, a set of customized expectations may be developed annually by the state with each school and system to address the unique issues that the school faces in the coming school year. These expectations will be based on the most recent school data analysis available.

In addition to focusing on work at the school level, the GaDOE has developed a process to work with districts in building capacity to support the schools within the district. The district effectiveness initiative is focused on providing expertise in implementing the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards and shifting to performance assessments aligned with the new standards.

**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 Title I school 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	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Beginning in the 2012 <del>2</del> 2013 school year, the choice requirement under the NCLB consequence structure was waived under Georgia's approved ESEA Flexibility Request given state legislation, GA code §20-2-2130 mandating school choice opportunities within all LEAs.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

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

**1.4.9.1.4 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	

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

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

**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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Beginning in the 2012-2013 school year, local education agencies (LEAs) replaced the tutorial services formerly conducted by Supplemental Educational Service (SES) providers, with a state-designed Flexible Learning Program (FLP) for Priority School students and Focus School students under Georgia's approved ESEA Flexibility Request. The choice requirement under the NCLB consequence structure is no longer necessary given state legislation, GA code §20-2-2130 mandating school choice opportunities within all LEAs.	

**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	\$
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Beginning in the 2012-2013 school year, local education agencies (LEAs) replaced the tutorial services formerly conducted by Supplemental Educational Service (SES) providers, with a state-designed Flexible Learning Program (FLP) for Priority School students and Focus School students under Georgia's approved ESEA Flexibility Request. The choice requirement under the NCLB consequence structure is no longer necessary given state legislation, GA code §20-2-2130 mandating school choice opportunities within all LEAs.	

**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.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	289,402	284,757	98.39	4,645	1.61
All elementary classes	103,142	101,416	98.33	1,726	1.67
All secondary classes	186,260	183,341	98.43	2,919	1.57

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.

Both are used in elementary school. Some schools have departmentalized math, science, social studies, and reading with different teachers teaching different content. Others have one teacher teaching all the content.
---

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.

--

**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>1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes</b>	
<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	9.40
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	7.70
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	40.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	42.90
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comment from the Professional Standards Commission which the teacher certifying agency responsible for determining Highly Qualified. Other in this case is entirely made up of what we call ambiguous coded records. These are records which were pulled from CPI but our system was unable to determine what the educator was actually doing for credential verification. Systems are given 6 months to correct.

<b>1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes</b>	
<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)	16.10
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	24.50
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	56.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	3.40
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comment from the Professional Standards Commission which the teacher certifying agency responsible for determining Highly Qualified. Other in this case is entirely made up of what we call ambiguous coded records. These are records which were pulled from CPI but our system was unable to determine what the educator was actually doing for credential verification. Systems are given 6 months to correct.

**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	33,716	33,362	98.95
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	24,941	24,740	99.19
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	33,818	32,701	96.70
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	61,219	60,632	99.04

**1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks**

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	80.50	45.40
Poverty metric used	The poverty metric used was the annual collection of Free and Reduced Priced Lunch data.	
Secondary schools	80.60	45.50
Poverty metric used	The poverty metric used was the annual collection of Free and Reduced Priced Lunch data.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A large percentage of LEAs utilize the Push-In model in addition to other models, which allows the ESOL teacher to enter the regular education classroom and work directly with ELs, providing targeted language support within the content area classroom. A significant number of LEAs have provided SIOP training to teachers to ensure that academic content material taught in the general education classroom is comprehensible to ELs, promoting English language development, along with content area proficiency. SIOP training provides teachers with a well-articulated and practical method of sheltered instruction to facilitate high quality instruction for ELs in content areas.

Although dual language programs are not widely implemented in Georgia at this time, the number of programs is increasing. Dual language programs have been developed and implemented both in charter schools and traditional public schools in Georgia and as these programs continue to expand, an increasing number of LEAs have expressed interest in pursuing the implementation of dual language as a program model.

**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	94,034
<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 in the State 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.	90,521
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	73,574
No linguistic content; Not applicable	5,565
Vietnamese	2,493
Korean	1,545
Chinese	1,536

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category "No linguistic content" listed above as the second most commonly spoken language represents Georgia LEP students who speak languages categorized as "Other African", "Other Asian", "Other Indian", "Other European". The Georgia master language code individually lists the primary languages in each group spoken by Georgia LEP students, but does not separately list every individual language within those categories. Other major language groups represented in Georgia are Arabic, French, Amharic, Gujarati, Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Russian, and Urdu.

**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).

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	87,121
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,423
<b>Total</b>	<b>93,544</b>

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All K2 English Learners, coded EL-Y, and enrolled in a Georgia school at any time during the 2012-13 school year are included in the total count of Title III LEP students tested on the annual state ELP assessment. Students are coded EL-Y. Upon determination of eligibility and remain coded as such until their status changes to EL-M. ACCESS for ELLs is the annual ELP assessment. In Georgia, this assessment is administered during a specific testing window between late January and the beginning of March (1/22/13-3/5/13).

Students who enter Georgia schools outside the ACCESS testing window dates are reported as EL-Y upon screening & meeting eligibility requirements; however, if they were not enrolled during the ELP assessment testing window, the ACCESS wasn't administered to them. Because the population can be highly mobile, a significant number of ELs may withdraw and move to another state before the testing window opens or enroll after the testing window has ended, yet still be included in the total count of LEP students in the state.

The number tested on the ELP assessment includes all LEP students who participated in one or more domains of the assessment. This number includes students with disabilities of a nature that may have prevented participation in all domains of the assessment. This may include blind students unable to see a picture & describe it for the speaking or writing domains or deaf students or severely hearing impaired who are unable to respond to oral questions in the listening domain.

While the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment was administered in 2012-13 to students with severe cognitive disabilities who met criteria for this alternative proficiency assessment, there is still a very small population of students in the state who by the nature/severity of their disabilities are unable to participate in any domain of the test. These students are included in the count of those not tested on the ELP assessment.

Student Record data collections and ACCESS for ELLs assessment data were reviewed to determine the number of students not participating in ACCESS administration for the reasons listed above. Data reflect 4045 EL-Y students withdrew prior to the opening of the testing window & did not enroll in another GA public school & 1,179 EL-Y students entered a GA public school for the first time after the test window closed. For EL-Y students with special needs who did not participate, data reflect 1 blind student; 56 deaf students; 7 with severe/profound intellectual disabilities; and 59 identified as significant developmental delay. While data report 29 students with autism who did not participate in the assessment, GA data collection methods do not allow determination of the exact number of students whose autism may be so severe that they are non-verbal and have no written language. Data also reflect 400 students withdrew during the test window without having been assessed and did not enroll in another GA public school. Reasons for withdrawal and the number of students in each withdrawal category are: 129 students moved out of state; 68 students were withdrawn due to lack of attendance; 65 students moved out of the U.S.; 35 students graduated; 5 students were removed to the State Department of Juvenile Justice system; 10 students enrolled in private schools; 14 students withdrew to attend adult education programs; 5 students withdrew to home study programs; 3 were withdrawn for legal reasons; 2 students died; 2 students were expelled from school; 1 student withdrew due to pregnancy; 1 withdrew due to financial hardship; & 60 were withdrawn for unknown reasons. Student Record data collection methods are unable to determine the number of EL-Y students with a 504 plan or an IEP specifying the student's English proficiency will not be assessed or EL-Y who may have been absent during testing window and not tested.

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

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15,506
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.80

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

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

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

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		84,088
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		5,975
<b>Total</b>		<b>90,063</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All Title III <del>LEP</del> English Learners, coded EL-Y, and enrolled in a Georgia school at any time during the 2012-13 school year are included in the total count of Title III ILEP students tested on the annual state ELP assessment. Students are coded EL-Y (LEP-Y) upon determination of eligibility and remain coded as such until their status changes to EL-M (LEP-M). ACCESS for ELLs is the annual ELP assessment. In Georgia, this assessment is administered during a specific testing window between late January and the beginning of March (1/22/13-3/5/13).</p> <p>Students who enter Georgia schools outside the ACCESS testing window dates are reported as EL-Y upon screening and meeting eligibility requirements; however, if they were not enrolled during the ELP assessment testing window, the ACCESS wasn't administered to them. Because the population can be highly mobile, a significant number of ELs may withdraw and move to another state before the testing window opens or enroll after the testing window has ended, yet still be included in the total count of LEP students in the state.</p> <p>The number tested on the ELP assessment includes all LEP students who participated in one or more domains of the assessment. This number includes students with disabilities of a nature that may have prevented participation in all domains of the assessment. This may include blind students unable to see a picture &amp; describe it for the speaking or writing domains or deaf students or severely hearing impaired who are not able to respond to oral questions in the listening domain.</p> <p>While the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment was administered in 2012-13 to students with severe cognitive disabilities who met the criteria for this alternative proficiency assessment, there is still a very small population of students in the state who by the nature and severity of their disabilities are unable to participate in any domain of the assessment. These students are included in the count of those not tested on the ELP assessment.</p> <p>Student Record data collections and ACCESS for ELLs assessment data were reviewed to determine the numbers of students not participating in ACCESS administration for the reasons listed above. Data reflect 3805 EL-Y students withdrew prior to the opening of the testing window &amp; did not enroll in another GA public school &amp; 1,143 EL-Y students entered a GA public school for the first time after the test window had closed. For EL-Y students with special needs who did not participate, data reflect 53 deaf students; 7 with severe or profound intellectual disabilities; and 55 identified as significant developmental delay. While data report 23 students with autism who did not participate in the assessment, GA data collection methods do not allow determination of the exact number of students whose autism may be so severe that they are non-verbal and have no written language. Data also reflect 354 students withdrew during the test window without having been assessed and did not enroll in another GA public school. Reasons for withdrawal and the number of students in each withdrawal category are: 121 students moved out of state; 68 students were withdrawn due to lack of attendance; 62 students moved out of the U.S.; 17 students graduated; 5 students were removed to the State Department of Juvenile Justice system; 8 students enrolled in private schools; 14 students withdrew to attend adult education programs; 5 students withdrew to home study programs; 3 were withdrawn for legal reasons; 2 students died; 2 students were expelled from school; 1 student withdrew due to pregnancy; 1 withdrew due to financial hardship; and 56 were withdrawn for unknown reasons. Student Record data collection methods are unable to determine the number of EL-Y students with a 504 plan or an IEP specifying the student's English proficiency will not be assessed or EL-Y who may have been absent during testing window and not tested.</p>		

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

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		24,650

**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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	40,462	68.07	30,834	52.00
Attained proficiency	10,887	12.95	6,083	7.30
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia provides testing of academic content knowledge in English only.	

**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)
None
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not administer native language assessments for ESEA accountability for mathematics.

**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)
None
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not administer native language assessments for <i>ESEA</i> accountability for reading/language arts.

**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)
None
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Georgia does not administer native language assessments for <i>ESEA</i> accountability for science.

**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
14,449	11,468	25,917
<b>Comments:</b> 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
20,480	S	89.4	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
21,269	S	97.1	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
20,843	S	83.4	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	89
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	42
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	89
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	87
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	44
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 2011-12 and 2012-13)	23
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)	4

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. Georgia has a single statewide consortium comprised in 2012-13 of 84 LEAs reporting ELs but with a population too small to qualify for individual Title III allocations. The 84 districts are located geographically throughout the entire state. The Georgia Title III Consortium is considered a single subgrantee and AMAOs 1, 2 and 3 are calculated for the consortium as a single entity.

**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.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
17,760	1,480	10

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

**Note:** Section 3301(8) – The term ' Language instruction educational program ' means an instruction course – (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.	2,063
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*.	420

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.

Despite the current economic recession in Georgia, the EL K-12 population in the state increased 3.7% from 2011-12 to 2012-13. While new families are moving into Georgia each year for work reasons, Georgia is a designated key refugee location center and therefore, will continue to experience annual increases in the EL student population. Additionally, the largest population of ELs entering Georgia public schools is at the Kindergarten level and many of Georgia's future public school LEP students are born in the United States, a number of them in Georgia. This trend is expected to continue as children of families who have made their homes in Georgia reach school age and enroll in local schools.

The estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers needed for Title III language instruction is based on the expectation that the total EL student population will continue to grow by approximately 3.5% per year or approximately 17,645 students over the next five years. As the number of ELs in schools increases, more LEAs are incorporating sheltered content instruction classes for ELs into local school schedules to better serve the academic needs of EL students. The number of additional certified/licensed teachers, 420, resulted from dividing 17,646 (3.5% growth per year for 5 years) new EL students by 42, the number of ELs the state funding formula anticipates being assigned to an ESOL teacher, as well as replacing the ESOL teacher positions lost or not established in the past three years due to extreme budget cuts at the district level.

Georgia Department of Education Title III and Title I programs have collaborated for several years to offer on-line ESOL Endorsement opportunities to districts in rural areas as availability of endorsement programs is often limited to the more populous areas of the state. A number of the larger school districts and Regional Education Service Agencies (RESAs) also offer ESOL Endorsements and training as part of their professional learning programs. A number of universities in the state offer either the ESOL Endorsement or full ESOL teacher certification programs.

\* 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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	81
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	80
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	79
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	68
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	68
Other (Explain in comment box)	51

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	77	59,596
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	80	5,586
PD provided to principals	74	2,621
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	73	2,995
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	64	5,668
PD provided to community based organization personnel	39	2,632
Total	//////////	79,098

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other" category encompasses subgrantees that had teachers or administrators enrolled in the Georgia ESOL Endorsement course sequence offered in an approved program through their local school district, a Regional Education Services Agency (RESA) or a college or university. It also includes subgrantees that offered training on a variety of other topics related to ELs, including Common Core Georgia Performance Standards training sessions; using Thinking Maps to support academic success; integration of the WIDA ELD Standards with CCGPS; differentiation for ELs at varying levels of English proficiency; supporting teachers of ELs with disabilities; awareness and respect for cultural differences and diversity; training community liaisons to support student and parent engagement; and record keeping requirements for language assistance programs, including appropriate monitoring students who have recently exited language assistance services.

**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 2012-13 funds July 1, 2012, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2012, for SY 2012-13 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/12/12	8/22/12	40
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Georgia State Board of Education approves all grant awards to local school systems. The Georgia Department of Education Title II Unit received its initial notification of the Title III allocation from the ED Title III Program Officer on July 12, 2012. State Board of Education procedures do not permit approval of allocations prior to receipt of the exact dollar amount of the allocation. The Georgia SBOE met on August 22, 2012 and approved the grant awards as part of the meeting agenda.		

**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.

Georgia Department of Education Title III Unit has taken a proactive approach, preparing an item for information for the State Board of Education prior to receiving the grant award. This is not standard operating procedure and does not guarantee that grant funds will be made available more quickly, but does ensure that the State Board of Education has all pertinent information regarding the Title III grant and will be ready to approve the item at their first meeting following receipt of the grant award. Funds may not be distributed until formal approval of the amount is granted by the State Board of Education.

**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/unsafechoice.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 youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	143	143
LEAs with subgrants	55	55
Total	198	198

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

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	186	511
K	830	3,112
1	774	2,754
2	704	2,575
3	651	2,532
4	603	2,311
5	545	2,370
6	572	2,260
7	591	2,052
8	537	2,060
9	483	2,551
10	384	1,566
11	271	1,234
12	365	1,550
Ungraded		
Total	7,496	29,438

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

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

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	440	3,743
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,337	20,441
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	145	604
Hotels/Motels	574	4,650
Total	7,496	29,438

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

**1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled**

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	403	1,622
Migratory children/youth	89	152
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,169	4,578
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	235	1,022

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

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	509
K	3,035
1	2,677
2	2,505
3	2,469
4	2,253
5	2,308
6	2,207
7	2,002
8	2,019
9	2,492
10	1,538
11	1,219
12	1,538
Ungraded	
Total	28,781

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

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,619
Migratory children/youth	151
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,492
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,018

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

**1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	469	432	1,877	1,657
4	443	388	1,674	1,403
5	414	378	1,768	1,632
6	431	384	1,643	1,479
7	432	382	1,486	1,312
8	403	392	1,496	1,423
High School	223	183	873	726

**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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	471	323	1,881	1,159
4	444	334	1,680	1,123
5	414	366	1,778	1,496
6	431	303	1,643	1,095
7	434	360	1,494	1,151
8	405	325	1,502	1,119
High School	267	149	1,085	504

**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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	469	332	1,878	1,164
4	444	347	1,676	1,112
5	414	307	1,776	1,154
6	431	261	1,641	915
7	432	341	1,480	1,087
8	401	250	1,488	816
High School	281	172	1,323	766

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