

**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

NEW MEXICO



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: New Mexico Public Education Department		
Address: 300 Don Gaspar Avenue Santa Fe, NM 87501		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Lisa Hamilton		
Telephone: 505-827-7931		
Fax: 505-827-1826		
e-mail: lisa.hamilton@state.nm.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lisa Hamilton		
_____ Signature		_____ Wednesday, April 16, 2014, 5:13:20 PM

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

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	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.

--

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
No Revisions or changes	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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

--

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
No Revisions or changes	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

New Mexico is moving to PARCC assessments in 2014-15. Toward that end computer based testing was implemented in 2013-14 for a small number of pilot districts. Alignment studies are underway to supply information on CCSS overlap on existing assessments, and new reports are being provided to LEAs. Accountability decisions will be revisited after the inaugural year of PARCC.

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)	90.00
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	10.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 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)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<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	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

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	194,111	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	19,421	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	2,973	≥99
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	4,372	99.5
Hispanic or Latino	S	117,471	99.5
White	S	49,874	99.6
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	25,793	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	29,978	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	S	135,904	99.5
Migratory students	S	188	≥95
Male	S	98,859	99.5
Female	S	95,252	99.6
Comments: 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,047	35.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,880	57.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,866	7
Total	25,793	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	194,272	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	19,443	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	2,966	≥99
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	4,384	99.7
Hispanic or Latino	S	117,578	99.6
White	S	49,901	99.6
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	25,836	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	29,955	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	S	136,030	99.5
Migratory students	S	186	≥95
Male	S	98,945	99.5
Female	S	95,327	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	42

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,703	76.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,230	16.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,902	7
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	1	S
Total	25,836	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In response to 1.2.3. The 42 recently arrived LEP students is correct.

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	70,574	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	7,125	99.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	1,076	≥99
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	1,637	≥99
Hispanic or Latino	S	42,432	99.2
White	S	18,304	99.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	9,255	98.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	10,030	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	S	48,516	99.2
Migratory students	S	62	≥95
Male	S	35,616	99.1
Female	S	34,958	99.4

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	3,551	38.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,012	54.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	692	7
Total	9,255	

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	25,458	S	51.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,534	S	37
Asian or Pacific Islander	369	S	77
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	556	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	15,739	S	46.7
White	6,260	S	66.1
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,398	S	20.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,613	S	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	19,145	S	44.3
Migratory students	31	S	48
Male	13,000	S	50.8
Female	12,458	S	51.2

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate data by two or more races for assessment reporting.

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	25,457	S	55.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,529	S	39
Asian or Pacific Islander	367	S	75
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	557	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	15,744	S	51.0
White	6,260	S	71.1
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,407	S	20.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,590	S	35.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19,144	S	48.4
Migratory students	31	S	39
Male	13,005	S	51.0
Female	12,452	S	59.7

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate data by two or more races for assessment reporting.

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	2		
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino	1		
White	1		
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2		
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1		
Economically disadvantaged students	2		
Migratory students			
Male	1		
Female	1		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not tested in this grade. The few students that remain are from the alternate assessment which is a grade band which captures the lowest grade in the grade band for reporting.			

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	25,055	S	45.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,437	S	31
Asian or Pacific Islander	387	S	72
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	538	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	15,505	S	40.8
White	6,188	S	62.0
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,610	S	16.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,606	S	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	18,737	S	38.1
Migratory students	21	S	28.6
Male	12,615	S	45.3
Female	12,440	S	45.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for reporting.			

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	25,022	S	45.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,439	S	29
Asian or Pacific Islander	383	S	68
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	538	S	43
Hispanic or Latino	15,480	S	41.3
White	6,182	S	62.6
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,595	S	15.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,586	S	17.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,708	S	37.9
Migratory students	22	S	27
Male	12,598	S	40.8
Female	12,424	S	50.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for reporting.			

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	25,012	S	53.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,429	S	32
Asian or Pacific Islander	386	S	74
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	537	S	48.0
Hispanic or Latino	15,479	S	48.2
White	6,181	S	72.8
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,599	S	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,591	S	24.4
Economically disadvantaged students	18,701	S	45.1
Migratory students	22	S	27
Male	12,591	S	53.6
Female	12,421	S	52.6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for reporting.			

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	25,274	S	43.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,500	S	28
Asian or Pacific Islander	366	S	74
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	546	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	15,663	S	37.7
White	6,199	S	61.5
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,811	S	13.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,012	S	15.2
Economically disadvantaged students	18,853	S	35.4
Migratory students	17	S	24
Male	12,918	S	43.0
Female	12,356	S	43.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for reporting.

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	25,274	S	51.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,498	S	34
Asian or Pacific Islander	365	S	75
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	547	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	15,665	S	46.5
White	6,199	S	69.0
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,809	S	15.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,000	S	17.3
Economically disadvantaged students	18,853	S	43.5
Migratory students	16	S	44
Male	12,913	S	45.4
Female	12,361	S	57.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for reporting.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

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

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	25,082	S	39.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,412	S	27
Asian or Pacific Islander	358	S	71
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	541	S	29
Hispanic or Latino	15,429	S	35.0
White	6,342	S	55.0
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,660	S	11.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,613	S	12.3
Economically disadvantaged students	18,174	S	32.1
Migratory students	23	S	35
Male	12,820	S	38.5
Female	12,262	S	40.9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting.			

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	25,068	S	46.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,412	S	33
Asian or Pacific Islander	355	S	70
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	540	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	15,429	S	42.3
White	6,332	S	62.3
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,661	S	14.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,603	S	13.2
Economically disadvantaged students	18,174	S	39.7
Migratory students	22	S	36
Male	12,812	S	41.4
Female	12,256	S	52.5
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

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	24,644	S	41.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,494	S	28
Asian or Pacific Islander	330	S	72
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	601	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	14,953	S	36.3
White	6,266	S	57.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,403	S	12.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,603	S	12.0
Economically disadvantaged students	17,568	S	33.6
Migratory students	25	S	16
Male	12,586	S	39.4
Female	12,058	S	43.3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting.			

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	24,663	S	49.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,500	S	31
Asian or Pacific Islander	328	S	72
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	603	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	14,963	S	45.3
White	6,269	S	67.3
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,413	S	16.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,598	S	14.6
Economically disadvantaged students	17,583	S	42.1
Migratory students	25	S	24
Male	12,599	S	45.4
Female	12,064	S	54.6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting.			

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	24,617	S	42.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,484	S	22
Asian or Pacific Islander	330	S	63
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	600	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	14,938	S	35.8
White	6,265	S	64.6
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,404	S	16.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,598	S	8.3
Economically disadvantaged students	17,540	S	33.1
Migratory students	25	S	16
Male	12,565	S	42.5
Female	12,052	S	41.9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting.			

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	24,674	S	42.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,499	S	29
Asian or Pacific Islander	385	S	76
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	571	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	14,855	S	36.9
White	6,364	S	58.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,138	S	12.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,499	S	14.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,290	S	34.8
Migratory students	29	S	45
Male	12,680	S	40.5
Female	11,994	S	44.2
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting.			

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	24,708	S	60.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,506	S	44
Asian or Pacific Islander	385	S	82
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	572	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	14,879	S	56.1
White	6,366	S	75.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,144	S	21.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,497	S	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17,318	S	53.1
Migratory students	29	S	69
Male	12,694	S	56.8
Female	12,014	S	63.9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting. The counts are correct.			

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	1		
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White	1		
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1		
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students	1		
Migratory students			
Male	1		
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This grade is not tested in science. The few remaining students are from the alternate which reports a grade band. Students are placed in the lowest grade of the grade band for reporting.			

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	43,924	S	35.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,545	S	26.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	778	S	67
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	1,019	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	25,327	S	29.0
White	12,255	S	52.1
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,773	S	10.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,032	S	7.3
Economically disadvantaged students	26,137	S	26.0
Migratory students	42	S	19
Male	22,240	S	36.9
Female	21,684	S	34.6

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico tests two grades, 10th and 11th. Last year we only reported 11th to be consistent with prior years. Now we are combining both per guidance from U.S. Dept of Ed.

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	44,038	S	47.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,559	S	33.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	774	S	68
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	1,027	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	25,401	S	42.1
White	12,277	S	63.9
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,806	S	14.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,045	S	9.5
Economically disadvantaged students	26,221	S	37.8
Migratory students	41	S	22
Male	22,305	S	41.6
Female	21,733	S	54.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico tests two grades, 10th and 11th. Last year we only reported 11th to be consistent with prior years. Now we are combining both per guidance from U.S. Dept of Ed.

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	20,942	S	39.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,212	S	22
Asian or Pacific Islander	360	S	63
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	500	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	12,014	S	31.4
White	5,856	S	62.2
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,249	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,840	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	12,272	S	27.5
Migratory students	15	S	<50
Male	10,458	S	44.2
Female	10,484	S	35.1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 10th and 11th grades are tested in Math. Only 11th is tested in science. New Mexico does not disaggregate by two or more races for assessment reporting.			

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. Not required due to 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 indicator³ 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	851	38	4.47
Districts	146	3	2.05

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

³ 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. Not required due to 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 indicator⁴ 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	629	23	3.66
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	604	18	2.98
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	25	5	20.00

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

⁴ 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. Not required due to 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 indicator⁵ 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
131	2	1.53

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

⁵ 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	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico is a waiver state and is not required to submit this data.	

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	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. New Mexico is a waiver state and is not required to submit this data.	

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.

New Mexico is a waiver state and is not required to submit this data.

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.

New Mexico is a waiver state and is not required to submit this data.

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. New Mexico is a waver state and is not required to submit this data.	

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	0	0
Schools	42	7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This was interpreted as a change in the school's overall ABCDF letter grade.		

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	08/30/13

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New Mexico was granted a waiver from AYP and will no longer be reporting this information. We require all districts to focus their efforts on five strategic levers for improvement:

Smarter Return on NM Investment -All New Mexico districts will align proven strategies for student success with expenditures in education.

Effective Options for Parents -Offering parents multiple educational opportunities for their children that meet their learning needs.

Ready for Success -To prepare students to succeed throughout their academic careers, districts will place a command- focus on literacy by prioritizing research-based strategies for reading interventions. This will ultimately lead to college success and career readiness. All New Mexico Districts will reduce the percentage of students retained in third grade due to literacy level.

Rewarding Effective Educators and Leaders -Identify objective criteria that establish a multi-tiered evaluation based to include regular feedback to teachers and aligned professional development.

Real Accountability, Real Results - Real Accountability, Real Results: A-F School Grade Accountability System is a transparent school-grading system that allows parents, teachers, students, and the community to understand the quality of education in our classrooms, creating a culture of higher expectations and greater achievement.

In addition New Mexico's Public Education Department provides additional support through the Instructional Audit. The Audit was revised to reflect the ESEA waiver. This New Mexico Instructional Audit (NMIA) is part of New Mexico's A-F School Grading Accountability System of school and district support. Its purpose is to improve instruction at the classroom level through examining systems that both support and monitor teachers and other instructional personnel. The audit generates data that inform the Educational Plan for Student Success (Web EPSS), the school's improvement plan, which is required for every school in the state.

The state's current system of school and district support is designed to help schools and districts meet state mandates as outlined in the approved "New Mexico ESEA Flexibility Request" (February 15, 2012). These mandates are as follows:

- Implementation of the college-and-career-readiness standards (Common Core State Standards);
- Development and administration of annual, statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth;
- Implementation of the state-developed A-F School Grading Accountability System, and
- Development and adoption of guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems.

The state's support system includes:

- Differentiated technical assistance;
- Opportunities for professional development;
- Annual budget reviews;
- Data driven decision making;
- Resources for best practices and research-based programs; and
- A number of tools to assist schools and districts in analyzing and determining their strengths and opportunities for improvement.

The New Mexico Instructional Audit is one of the tools, and serves as an independent examination of the operations and systems that support and relate to instruction. It serves as the mechanism for examining the systems in place and is supported by the school leadership to increase teacher effectiveness and enhance student learning through professional dialogue. It provides a means by which an auditor or auditors can compile data for feedback to a school about the instructional practices that were observed during the school visitation.

Curriculum and instruction were selected because they are at the core of the educational process. If some aspect of curriculum and/or instruction is problematic, students will not be achieving at the desired level. The audit is based on 13 indicators related to research and best practices for teaching and learning. The indicators state that all teachers and other instructional staff must:

1. Implement research-based strategies, interventions, and programs that ensure quality teaching and learning that meet student academic needs;
 2. Effectively employ a continuous improvement process in the classroom with students;
 3. Use data derived from short-cycle, other formative assessments, and summative assessments to refocus or modify instruction at the classroom or individual level to help all students meet high standards;
 4. Consistently implement the district policy for allocating and protecting instructional time in all core subject areas;
 5. Demonstrate appropriate content knowledge for effective and accurate instruction;
 6. Employ effective teaching strategies including differentiated instruction to meet the learning needs of all students;
 7. Provide specific and timely feedback to students on an ongoing basis, with students using feedback to improve performance;
 8. Offer students multiple opportunities for demonstrating proficiency;
 9. Implement curriculum and classroom assessments that are aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS);
 10. Maintain positive, respectful classroom climates and use effective classroom management strategies that are consistent with school and district policies to meet the learning needs of all students;
 11. Maintain a culture of respect where relationships, trust, communication, and collaboration are valued with the entire school community;
 12. Ensure that the school is a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning; and
 13. Ensure that the school has a culturally respectful environment.
- <http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/PrioritySchoolsIndexNMIA.html>

To support schools in reflecting on the systems and structures they have in place to support learning and student outcomes, PSB developed a series of research based tools for schools to use in collaborative dialogue to address:

- Math
- Literacy
- Systems and Structures

In the 2012-2013 school year, school and district leadership teams were required to complete these as a part of their improvement process.

Web EPSS Reviews

In New Mexico, LEAs use the SEA's online Web Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) an online tool to monitor the implementation and evaluate the effectiveness of a district and/or school improvement plan. The Web EPSS is designed to enhance capacity to track the implementation and evaluate the effectiveness of school and district improvement plans.

In the 2012-2013 SY, each schools with a grade of B, C, D and F - No Assigned Status; C and D, Strategic; D and F Focus, D and F Priority received a Web EPSS Review. The intent of this review is to provide feedback to the LEA/School on their plan.

The checklist addressed the following areas:

- Strengthening Reading Instructional Programs
- Tier II Supports for Students in Reading
 - Tier III Supports for Students in Reading
 - Professional Development to Support Reading
 - Collaboration Time for Teachers
 - Monitoring of Reading Instructional Program
 - College and Career Ready (Grades 9 - 12)
 - Use of Data to Analyze Reading
 - Focus on subgroup performance.

Strengthening Math Instructional Programs

- Tier II Supports for Students in Math
- Tier III Supports for Students in Math
- Professional Development to Support Math
- Collaboration Time for Teachers
- Monitoring of the Math Instructional Program
- College and Career Ready (Grades 9 - 12)
- Use of Data to Analyze Math

- Focus on subgroup performance.

Transformation Goal

- Use of Data
- Providing strong Leadership
- Effective Teaching
- Redesigning Day, Week, Year
- Parent, Family, and Community Involvement
- Safe School Environments

Evidence of Budget Assigned

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.

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required due to waiver.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

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

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. Not required due to waiver.

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.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required due to waiver.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required due to waiver.	

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	64,111	63,266	98.68	845	1.32
All elementary classes	18,509	18,208	98.37	301	1.63
All secondary classes	45,602	45,058	98.81	544	1.19

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New Mexico counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes	
Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	2.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	3.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	95.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have not selected other and therefore are not required to comment here.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes	
Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	16.20
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	24.60
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	59.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have not selected other and therefore are not required to comment here.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	4,110	4,063	98.86
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	4,685	4,626	98.74
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,351	13,184	98.75
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	8,380	8,339	99.51

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	99.00	56.60
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price Lunch	
Secondary schools	97.00	47.20
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price Lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish; Native American Lan
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish; Native American languages
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish; Native American Languages
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish; Native American Languages
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish; Native American languages
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New Mexico provides funding to support five different bilingual multicultural education programs: dual language immersion, maintenance, heritage and enrichment (not listed above as an option). These may be provided in combination with Title III-funded LEIPs, and many districts do. LEAS that apply for and receive Title III funds do not provide state-funded bilingual multicultural education programs mentioned above, provide ELD/SDAIE courses and/or pull-out ESL programs address the learning needs of LEP/ELL students.

In New Mexico, Dual Language and Two-way Immersion are the same program. We call it Dual Language Immersion and it means that two groups of students become bilingual and biliterate in both languages (English and the target/home/heritage language).

In New Mexico, Developmental bilingual education is called Maintenance.

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	59,071
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The reasons that explain why these students may not have been assessed include: absences (due to illness and other reasons); student mobility (within district, out-of-state); and student drop out.	

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.	54,859
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not all districts in New Mexico receive Title III funds and this explains the difference between total LEP students in the state and those i Title III LIEPs. Many small, rural districts go into consortias to receive Title III funds but others do not either apply or join consortias. Nevertheless, the expectation is that all LEP students will be provided with support services and/or teachers with appropriate credentials (TESOL) to address the academic and language learning needs of LEP students, as per Office for Civil Rights (OCR) policy.	

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	42,351
Navajo; Navaho	7,488
Nias	1,194
Caucasian (Other)	828
Vietnamese	311

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	53,512
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	184
Total	53,696
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The reasons that explain why these students may not have been assessed include: absences (due to illness and other reasons); student mobility (within district, out-of-state); and student drop out.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	8,002
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14.95
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 2011-2012, 6,909 ELL tested proficient (12.84%). This represents a 2.1% increase over the previous year (1,093 students).	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		53,512
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		184
Total		53,696
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

Title III First Time Tested		#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		12,735

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	21,496	52.72	19,165	47.00
Attained proficiency	8,002	14.95	5,351	10.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State exceeded its targets for AMAO 1 and AMAO 2.				

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,020	3,386	8,406
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,900	S	39.2	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Math assessment is administered at the 3 rd , and 11 th grades.			

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
6,898	S	43.6	S

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Reading/Language Arts assessment is administered at the 3rd, 4th, and 11th grades.

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
2,843	S	35	S

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Science assessment is only administered at the 4th, 7th, and 11th grade levels in New Mexico.

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	50
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	32
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	49
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	5
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2011-12 and 2012-13)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)	7

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. There are a total of 59 total districts and 7 State chartered schools receiving Title III funds, but due to low numbers of LEP/ELL students in rural, micro districts, these districts have forms consortias, which brings the number of total subgrantees to 50: 45 districts/state charters and 5 consortias.

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
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of New Mexico met AMAO 1: Making Progress. The AMAO 1 target for 2012-2013 was 47%. The State's result for AMAO 1 was 52%.	
The State of New Mexico met AMAO 2: Attaining Proficiency. The AMAO 2 target for 2012-2013 was 10%. The State's result for AMAO 2 was 15%.	
The State of New Mexico did not meet AMAO 3: Academic Proficiency. New Mexico has received an ESEA Flexibility Waiver. In New Mexico Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) has been replaced by School Growth Targets (SGTs) that have been established by the New Mexico Public Education Department. The reading SGT: 56.7% (all sub-groups) and the math SGT: 50% (all sub-groups).	
The State did not meet these academic proficiency targets for ELL students. State average for reading was 39% and for math was 27%. These percentages reflect ELLs as one group consisting of Current ELLs and Exited ELLs (calculation of AMAO 3 for Title III). However, ELLs are separated into two groups for the state's accountability model (current ELLs and exited ELLs).	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
4,517		

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.

No district (LEA) received a grant for a 3114(d)(1) program because no district has experienced a significant increase in immigrant students, as defined by the state previously, and as required by Section 3114(d)(1). To address this concern, the state is revising its guidelines, with USDE-OESE (Title III Group) input, to ensure that more districts are eligible for grant funding to support its immigrant student populations.

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.	2,677
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	500

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.

ELL students represent 17% of the total student population in New Mexico, yet the the percentage of teachers with the appropriate TESOL endorsement is 23%.

Given that there are 4,212 ELL students that are not in a Title III-funded program and that there are several rural micro districts in the state, the appropriately endorsed teachers may not be assigned to ELLs as needed.

Additionally, some endorsed teachers may not be serving in positions working directly with ELLs full-time (e.g. administrators, instructional coaches, etc.). Teachers with more credentials and years of experience tend to be recruited away from smaller more rural districts to more populated cities and towns. Thus small pockets of ELLs in remote areas of the state are less likely to have access to the most specialized teachers to work with them.

Thus, to address the teaching sorting issue and ensure that ELLs all across the state have teachers that are trained and qualified to meet their academic and language learning needs, the state needs an additional 500 appropriately endorsed teachers. Although the need is great, not enough teachers pursue TESOL endorsement, teaching in the needed assignment, or are assigned to out-of-classroom assignments. Some educators with the endorsement serve as administrators. Thus, the number of teachers with TESOL endorsements may not be assigned to the ELL students that need them. From the previous year, the state has added only 143 additional teachers.

* 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	50
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	50
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	50
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	50
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	50
Other (Explain in comment box)	50

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	50	800
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	50	500
PD provided to principals	50	300
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	50	275
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	50	125
PD provided to community based organization personnel	50	350
Total	////////////////////////////////////	2,350

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All subgrantees are required to provide professional development to ensure that personnel are prepared to meet the academic and language learning needs of their ELL students.

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
07/01/12	07/01/12	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The date we receive the allocation is the date the funds are made available to sub-grantees.

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>.

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and 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	127	127
LEAs with subgrants	19	19
Total	146	146

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)	6	648
K	80	860
1	76	899
2	70	911
3	67	910
4	62	940
5	57	891
6	53	846
7	48	786
8	58	838
9	103	832
10	67	601
11	92	407
12	79	374
Ungraded	0	0
Total	918	10,743

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Only grades 4, 7 and 11 received science assessments.

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	120	814
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	718	9,332
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	29	398
Hotels/Motels	41	567
Total	908	11,111

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to a collection error totals in 1.9.1.2 for PNR incorrectly included age-2 students. Because the age-0-2 data were collected manually and in the aggregate (LEA level) we cannot separate that data out of the PNR counts. There are 2 districts that reported age 0-2. One district had 375 students and second district had 52.

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	192	1,189
Migratory children/youth	6	28
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	152	1,973
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	253	2,468

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	427
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	610
K	717
1	773
2	800
3	798
4	850
5	809
6	776
7	718
8	786
9	773
10	570
11	382
12	347
Ungraded	0
Total	10,136

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	1,157
Migratory children/youth	25
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,788
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,239

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	51	15	678	249
4	43	9	654	161
5	43	12	664	212
6	42	10	596	161
7	33	11	555	157
8	42	13	545	244
High School	98	28	564	164

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	51	13	677	222
4	43	11	659	167
5	42	13	664	147
6	42	7	597	106
7	33	8	561	124
8	42	5	544	130
High School	98	13	561	99

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				
4	43	11	658	236
5				
6				
7	33	10	557	122
8				
High School	60	11	256	46

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Only grades 4, 7 and 11 received science assessments.