

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08

NORTH CAROLINA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* 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 *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: NC Department of Public Instruction		
Address: 6301 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-6301		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Karl R. Pond		
Telephone: 919-807-3241		
Fax: 919-807-4300		
e-mail: kpond@dpi.state.nc.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): June St. Clair Atkinson		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 3:17:28 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* 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

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In June 2009, the North Carolina Board of Education (SBE) will adopt new content standards for mathematics, science and grade 10 English/language arts. The new content standards for the other grades in English/language arts will be adopted by the SBE in June 2010.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (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 as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2007-2008, North Carolina implemented new reading/English/language arts assessments for grades 3-8 for the general assessment, the NCCLAS (LEP and IEP checklist format), NCEXTEND2 (modified achievement standards), and NCEXTEND1 (students with significant cognitive disabilities).

The revised general mathematics end-of-grade assessments for grades 3-8 were implemented in 2005-2006 and in algebra in 2006-2007. The alternates (NCCLAS, NCEXTEND1, NCEXTEND2) were also revised on the same schedule as the general mathematics assessments.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (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* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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 *NCLB* 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 *NCLB*. 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.

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	761,173	755,759	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,984	10,867	98.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,553	17,425	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	212,847	210,677	99.0
Hispanic	72,966	72,293	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	420,845	418,670	99.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	104,425	102,906	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	45,356	44,847	98.9
Economically disadvantaged students	352,124	349,261	99.2
Migratory students	764	755	98.8
Male	388,288	385,152	99.2
Female	372,885	370,607	99.4
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students 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	13,811	16.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	50,076	58.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	265	0.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	16,703	19.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,965	5.8
Total	85,820	
Comments: 1.3 includes grade 10, however, 1.2.2 does not. These numbers do not include the banked accommodations.		

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

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	764,071	759,987	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,988	10,935	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,691	17,575	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	213,429	211,780	99.2
Hispanic	73,103	72,479	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	422,767	421,262	99.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	98,614	97,684	99.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	45,352	44,902	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	352,701	350,475	99.4
Migratory students	762	755	99.1
Male	389,746	387,378	99.4
Female	374,325	372,609	99.5
Comments:			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

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

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* 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. Do not include results from students 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	20,181	17.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	64,141	56.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	421	0.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	23,190	20.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,514	5.7
Total	114,447	
Comments: 1.3 includes grade 10, however, 1.2.4 does not. These numbers do not include the banked accommodations.		

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

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 *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	310,347	298,837	96.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,287	4,048	94.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,460	7,129	95.6
Black, non-Hispanic	89,208	84,746	95.0
Hispanic	26,479	25,371	95.8
White, non-Hispanic	176,900	171,769	97.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	37,724	33,937	90.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,573	19,645	95.5
Economically disadvantaged students	133,345	127,836	95.9
Migratory students	114	105	92.1
Male	158,768	150,017	94.5
Female	154,762	149,774	96.8
Comments: The groups under the 95% are reported correctly.			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

The data provided should include science participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students 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	3,951	13.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,264	56.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	798	2.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,784	20.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,773	6.2
Total	28,570	
Comments: 1.2.5 includes grade 11, however, 1.2.6 does not. Banked Accommodations are not available for the 07-08 year.		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* 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 in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

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. 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 *NCLB* 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 Proficiency (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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,152	84,350	73.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,692	1,130	66.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,622	2,271	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	31,208	16,941	54.3
Hispanic	12,983	8,586	66.1
White, non-Hispanic	61,728	51,742	83.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,835	8,686	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,881	4,344	55.1
Economically disadvantaged students	57,766	35,365	61.2
Migratory students	150	92	61.3
Male	58,711	43,104	73.4
Female	56,441	41,246	73.1

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC,LEP and EDS, reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,118	62,759	54.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,692	664	39.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,616	1,727	66.0
Black, non-Hispanic	31,205	10,850	34.8
Hispanic	12,960	4,586	35.4
White, non-Hispanic	61,732	42,176	68.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,302	4,833	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,864	1,478	18.8
Economically disadvantaged students	57,742	21,799	37.8
Migratory students	150	41	27.3
Male	58,696	30,498	52.0
Female	56,422	32,261	57.2

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC,LEP and EDS, reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science assessments are only grades 5, 8 and HS.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	111,743	81,339	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,664	1,074	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,628	2,289	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	29,782	16,129	54.2
Hispanic	12,020	7,930	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	61,224	50,697	82.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,318	7,786	47.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,277	4,049	55.6
Economically disadvantaged students	54,851	33,276	60.7
Migratory students	103	50	48.5
Male	57,170	41,277	72.2
Female	54,573	40,062	73.4

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question. ED reflects the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	111,713	66,093	59.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,664	747	44.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,624	1,826	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	29,783	11,748	39.4
Hispanic	11,995	4,985	41.6
White, non-Hispanic	61,221	44,139	72.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,761	4,823	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,256	1,864	25.7
Economically disadvantaged students	54,834	23,763	43.3
Migratory students	103	24	23.3
Male	57,154	32,290	56.5
Female	54,559	33,803	62.0

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question. For EC and EDS, reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science assessments are only grades 5, 8 and HS.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	110,075	76,650	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,548	852	55.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,680	2,328	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	30,185	15,427	51.1
Hispanic	11,151	6,881	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	60,369	48,303	80.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,959	7,225	45.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,027	4,409	54.9
Economically disadvantaged students	53,162	30,021	56.5
Migratory students	131	69	52.7
Male	56,151	38,920	69.3
Female	53,924	37,730	70.0

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC,LEP and EDS, reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	110,042	61,238	55.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,548	594	38.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,672	1,803	67.5
Black, non-Hispanic	30,182	10,974	36.4
Hispanic	11,131	4,281	38.5
White, non-Hispanic	60,368	41,246	68.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,022	4,066	27.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,013	2,098	26.2
Economically disadvantaged students	53,143	20,674	38.9
Migratory students	131	41	31.3
Male	56,135	29,664	52.8
Female	53,907	31,574	58.6

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC,LEP and EDS, reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	109,721	42,427	38.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,535	339	22.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,718	1,498	55.1
Black, non-Hispanic	29,993	5,324	17.8
Hispanic	11,269	2,605	23.1
White, non-Hispanic	60,080	32,661	54.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,428	3,233	22.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,732	2,028	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	53,078	12,418	23.4
Migratory students	50	11	22.0
Male	55,950	25,007	44.7
Female	53,771	19,015	35.4
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	108,046	73,708	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,597	910	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,533	2,155	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	29,979	14,527	48.5
Hispanic	10,706	6,295	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	59,513	47,284	79.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,647	6,300	43.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,820	3,303	48.4
Economically disadvantaged students	51,273	27,701	54.0
Migratory students	120	49	40.8
Male	55,339	37,245	67.3
Female	52,707	36,463	69.2

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC and LEP reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	108,039	64,102	59.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,597	749	46.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,522	1,834	72.7
Black, non-Hispanic	29,998	11,873	39.6
Hispanic	10,695	4,742	44.3
White, non-Hispanic	59,510	42,616	71.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,717	3,791	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,811	2,007	29.5
Economically disadvantaged students	51,272	21,950	42.8
Migratory students	119	31	26.1
Male	55,345	30,895	55.8
Female	52,694	33,207	63.0

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC and EDS, reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science assessments are only grades 5, 8 and HS.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	109,308	73,580	67.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,569	838	53.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,391	2,077	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	31,228	15,076	48.3
Hispanic	10,044	5,876	58.5
White, non-Hispanic	60,581	47,395	78.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,685	6,023	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,306	3,028	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	50,460	26,649	52.8
Migratory students	101	44	43.6
Male	56,352	36,948	65.6
Female	52,956	36,632	69.2

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC and LEP reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	109,319	55,881	51.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,570	517	32.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,390	1,581	66.2
Black, non-Hispanic	31,248	9,710	31.1
Hispanic	10,031	3,583	35.7
White, non-Hispanic	60,583	38,600	63.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,608	3,031	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,299	1,230	19.5
Economically disadvantaged students	50,469	16,998	33.7
Migratory students	100	18	18.0
Male	56,365	27,171	48.2
Female	52,954	28,710	54.2

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC and LEP reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science assessments are only grades 5, 8 and HS.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	110,657	75,498	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,618	872	53.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,499	2,146	85.9
Black, non-Hispanic	32,607	16,189	49.6
Hispanic	9,483	5,589	58.9
White, non-Hispanic	61,288	48,504	79.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,538	5,952	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,441	2,559	47.0
Economically disadvantaged students	49,848	26,837	53.8
Migratory students	93	47	50.5
Male	56,584	37,664	66.6
Female	54,073	37,834	70.0

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC and LEP reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	110,619	59,921	54.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,617	593	36.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,496	1,596	63.9
Black, non-Hispanic	32,593	10,738	32.9
Hispanic	9,470	3,478	36.7
White, non-Hispanic	61,287	41,665	68.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,498	3,285	24.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,440	970	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	49,816	18,065	36.3
Migratory students	93	20	21.5
Male	56,572	29,389	51.9
Female	54,047	30,532	56.5

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question.
For EC and LEP reflect the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	106,963	55,161	51.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,608	484	30.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,560	1,705	66.6
Black, non-Hispanic	32,315	8,615	26.7
Hispanic	9,549	3,439	36.0
White, non-Hispanic	60,931	40,918	67.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,105	3,623	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,201	2,075	28.8
Economically disadvantaged students	49,604	16,454	33.2
Migratory students	40	8	20.0
Male	56,206	30,452	54.2
Female	53,890	26,482	49.1
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,778	61,822	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,179	654	55.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,072	1,725	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	25,688	12,367	48.1
Hispanic	5,906	3,543	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	53,967	42,165	78.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,924	4,197	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,095	1,522	49.2
Economically disadvantaged students	31,901	17,085	53.6
Migratory students	57	30	52.6
Male	44,845	30,344	67.7
Female	45,933	31,478	68.5

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question. EC reflects the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	95,137	62,529	65.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,247	591	47.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,255	1,653	73.3
Black, non-Hispanic	26,771	12,710	47.5
Hispanic	6,197	3,148	50.8
White, non-Hispanic	56,561	42,934	75.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,776	2,473	25.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,219	887	27.6
Economically disadvantaged students	33,199	15,934	48.0
Migratory students	59	21	35.6
Male	47,111	28,350	60.2
Female	48,026	34,179	71.2

Comments: For the Migrant data, we had better data this year due to reconciliation of ids and use of authoritative source data. Scan sheets are no longer the source for collection of the data in question. EC reflects the data from authoritative systems.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	82,153	55,958	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	905	554	61.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,851	1,429	77.2
Black, non-Hispanic	22,438	10,700	47.7
Hispanic	4,553	2,608	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	50,758	40,667	80.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,404	2,783	43.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,712	1,238	45.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,154	13,262	52.7
Migratory students	15	5	33.3
Male	40,040	28,542	71.3
Female	42,113	28,638	68.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,956	626	32.0
Districts	115	9	7.8

Comments: NOTE: We have found in our corrections that this data are incorrect. The data will be re-submitted through EDEN to reflect the following: Schools Total 2412 Made, AYP: 753, Perct 31.2 - Districts Total 115, Made AYP 0, Perct 0

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. 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 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	966	341	35.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	799	273	34.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	167	68	40.7

Comments: NOTE: We have found in our corrections that this data are incorrect. The data will be re-submitted through EDEN to reflect the following: Title I Schools Total 1134, Made AYP: 376, Perct 33.2

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
115	0	0.0

Comments: NOTE: We have found in our corrections that this data are incorrect. The data will be re-submitted through EDEN to reflect the following: Title I Districs Total 115, Made AYP: 0, Perct 0

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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 *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	10
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	8
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	7
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	10
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	14
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 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)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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.

Districts entering Sanction Levels 3 or 4 of District Improvement under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation were served through capacity-building professional development designed to understand the central office role in using research-based "gap closing" practices to ensure full alignment and implementation of the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

Professional Development

"Aligning Curriculum to Improve Academic Rigor and Grade Level Proficiency" focused on four practices:

- focusing improvement through the use of data;
- aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study;
- monitoring changes to achieve good results; and
- expecting results from alignment and district support.

Each district was provided a full set of its data for use in the training to ensure that new learning was applied and planning was practical for the unique aspects of the district.

Participants

Districts brought teams of at least three central office administrators responsible for curriculum and instruction. Each team worked with a Department of Public Instruction facilitator or coach to ensure application to the local context.

Extended Support

Follow-up to the training was provided through technical assistance provided through District and School Transformation, as well as consults for Title I monitoring.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 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 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	26
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	11/18/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	137,020	139,212
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	78,928	74,126
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	57.6	53.2
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	58,098	106,711
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	42.4	76.7
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	453	
Comments:		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	112
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	640
Comments:	

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<p>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy (s) in Column 2.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
1	<p>North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.</p>	0	0	0	A	<p>North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.</p>
2	<p>North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.</p>	0	0	0	A	<p>North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.</p>
	<p>North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data</p>					<p>North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data</p>

3	items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.	0	0	0	A	items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.
4	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.	0	0	0	A	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.
5	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.	0	0	0	A	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.
6 = Combo 1	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.	0	0	0	A	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.
7 = Combo 2	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.	0	0	0	A	North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.
	North Carolina has not					North Carolina has not

8 = Combo 3	collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.	0	0	0	A	collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comments: North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3. Beginning with 2008-2009, our current data collection system for federal program reporting is being enhanced to capture the additional elements that were not heretofore required for CSPR. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding is being revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system.

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

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

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) 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*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina's statewide system of support is coordinated and monitored through three interlocking roundtables. The roundtable structure includes a Strategic Roundtable, an Agency Roundtable, and eight Regional Roundtables.

The Strategic Roundtable is comprised of NCDPI senior leadership and meets quarterly to manage the selection of transformation districts and schools as well as monitoring progress toward the priority objectives.

Measurable goals and objectives for schools/districts receiving assistance:

- An increase in the percentage of NCLB targets met
- Progress in making growth
- An increase in the percentage of students scoring at achievement Levels III and IV (proficiency)

Other support objectives:

- Assisting the school in making data-driven decisions to improve student achievement
- Increasing the school's capacity to achieve student academic growth over time for all student subgroups
- Enhancing the staff's knowledge and delivery of best practices
- Building the skills of teachers and administrators

The Agency Roundtable is comprised of all NCDPI division directors and meets monthly to facilitate ongoing initiatives within the statewide system of support. The Title I Director serves on this roundtable. The Roundtable identifies current initiatives being provided to the region by the agency; reviews comprehensive needs assessment outcomes; identifies gaps and redundancies; targets available resources to identified needs; and routes continued services through NCDPI staff assigned to regions, districts, and schools.

The eight Regional Roundtables are comprised of regional NCDPI staff and representatives of the Regional Education Services Areas (RESAs) and the Office of School Readiness. The Roundtables meet monthly to identify current initiatives underway in each district in the region, to identify common needs across each region, and to coordinate technical assistance provided for the districts and schools identified as having the greatest need for support. Roundtables are facilitated by NCDPI Regional Leads, one assigned to each of the eight regions across North Carolina. A Title I consultant serves on each Regional Roundtable in order to ensure that statutory requirements are understood by all parties and appropriate services and support are brokered for Title I schools.

Ultimately, the statewide system of support provides customized technical assistance designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and sustain improvement efforts. The roundtables provide a forum for continuous communication and collaboration within the agency in order to most effectively customize the support.

Technical assistance for all LEAs and charter schools is coordinated through the roundtables. Service delivery is provided internally through NCDPI agency and regional staff to include initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RTI) training by NCDPI Exceptional Children staff. Services are also brokered with various partnerships for support to include, NC RESAs, the New Schools Project, The Collaborative Project, the UNC Center for School Leadership and Development, and the Appalachian Regional Comprehensive Center (ARCC).

For example, NCDPI and ARCC have developed a management plan addressing key agency initiatives with the primary overarching objective being to extend and enhance the comprehensive support plan to address NCLB goals and strengthen the statewide system of support for districts and schools. Another example is demonstrated in the work of The Collaborative Project, funded by the North Carolina General Assembly. The project focuses on five public school systems that serve low-income students in rural areas. The objective of this work is to show measurable student growth and create a positive learning and teaching environment for young people and educators.

Measurable goals and objectives of Service Delivery:

- An increase in the percentage of NCLB targets met
- An improvement in the performance of each subgroup aggregated at the district level
- An increase in the number of students scoring at achievement Levels III and IV in the district's schools
- An increase in the number of students successfully graduating from high school

Other objectives include:

- Assisting the central office to support schools more effectively, efficiently, and equitably so that all schools are on track to meet state and federal accountability goals
- Assisting districts and schools in making data-driven decisions to improve student achievement
- Conducting a needs assessment and providing the support and guidance through regional roundtables
- Assisting districts and schools in developing:
 - greater understanding of the significance of planning
 - greater knowledge of leadership and the roles of central office staff and school leaders
 - greater knowledge of the tools/processes used in monitoring instruction and increased ability to effectively monitor instruction
 - increased ability to use data strategically to establish district instructional priorities
 - increased ability to align resources and activities to support priorities.

In support of local school and district improvement efforts, NCDPI annually allocates 1003(a) funds to LEAs to provide additional resources for schools, which have been identified for School Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring. Funds will be allotted based on approval of an application for School Improvement (PRC105) funds submitted by the LEA or charter school on behalf of schools participating in Title I School Improvement. The application process includes a review of school level needs, the revision of school improvement plans aligned to requirements in Section 1116(b)(3), and requirements for parent notifications.

Additionally, NCDPI allocates 1003(g) funds to LEAs to provide assistance for schools, which have been identified for Corrective Action or Restructuring and have shown progress in improving student performance. Funds will be allotted based on approval of an addendum to the application for School Improvement (PRC105) funds submitted by the LEA or charter school on behalf of schools participating in Title I School Improvement. Schools eligible for funding are selected by the SEA based on Title I school improvement status and progress made in improving student performance.

Title I staff approves the applications for funding and monitors the use of funds on an annual basis. Efforts to support specific schools are coordinated through the Regional Roundtables and target areas including budgeting and resource allocation aligned to specific identified needs.

State administrative funds provided with 1003(a) and 1003(g) are utilized for leveraging the statewide system of support. Examples of initiatives supported with these funds include:

- Balanced Leadership training - Mid-Continent Research Education Laboratory (McREL)
- Developing a Framework for Action - University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Center for School Leadership
- Curriculum Alignment - NCDPI staff
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment - Cambridge Education

Continuous Coordination, Communication, and Collaboration

Although in 2007-2008, the new model focused efforts on two LEAs serving 25 schools, an additional 166 schools were served as part of previous assistance efforts. While the old model is phased out over the next two years of project commitment, NCDPI will expand the Comprehensive Support model to include four additional LEAs, including a total of 74 schools being served with the most intensive transformation services. The District and School Transformation Division provided the coordination of 105 professional development sessions in the summer of 2008. Leveraged efforts of the Reg

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 2007-08 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.

North Carolina's statewide system of support is coordinated and monitored through three interlocking roundtables. The roundtable structure includes a Strategic Roundtable, an Agency Roundtable, and eight Regional Roundtables.

The Strategic Roundtable is comprised of NCDPI senior leadership and meets quarterly to manage the selection of transformation districts and schools as well as monitoring progress toward the priority objectives.

Measurable goals and objectives for schools/districts receiving assistance:

- An increase in the percentage of NCLB targets met
- Progress in making growth
- An increase in the percentage of students scoring at achievement Levels III and IV (proficiency)

Other support objectives:

- Assisting the school in making data-driven decisions to improve student achievement
- Increasing the school's capacity to achieve student academic growth over time for all student subgroups
- Enhancing the staff's knowledge and delivery of best practices
- Building the skills of teachers and administrators

The Agency Roundtable is comprised of all NCDPI division directors and meets monthly to facilitate ongoing initiatives within the statewide system of support. The Title I Director serves on this roundtable. The Roundtable identifies current initiatives being provided to the region by the agency; reviews comprehensive needs assessment outcomes; identifies gaps and redundancies; targets available resources to identified needs; and routes continued services through NCDPI staff assigned to regions, districts, and schools.

The eight Regional Roundtables are comprised of regional NCDPI staff and representatives of the Regional Education Services Areas (RESAs) and the Office of School Readiness. The Roundtables meet monthly to identify current initiatives underway in each district in the region, to identify common needs across each region, and to coordinate technical assistance provided for the districts and schools identified as having the greatest need for support. Roundtables are facilitated by NCDPI Regional Leads, one assigned to each of the eight regions across North Carolina. A Title I consultant serves on each Regional Roundtable in order to ensure that statutory requirements are understood by all parties and appropriate services and support are brokered for Title I schools.

Ultimately, the statewide system of support provides customized technical assistance designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and sustain improvement efforts. The roundtables provide a forum for continuous communication and collaboration within the agency in order to most effectively customize the support.

Technical assistance for all LEAs and charter schools is coordinated through the roundtables. Service delivery is provided internally through NCDPI agency and regional staff to include initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RTI) training by NCDPI Exceptional Children staff. Services are also brokered with various partnerships for support to include, NC RESAs, the New Schools Project, The Collaborative Project, the UNC Center for School Leadership and Development, and the Appalachian Regional Comprehensive Center (ARCC).

For example, NCDPI and ARCC have developed a management plan addressing key agency initiatives with the primary overarching objective being to extend and enhance the comprehensive support plan to address NCLB goals and strengthen the statewide system of support for districts and schools. Another example is demonstrated in the work of The Collaborative Project, funded by the North Carolina General Assembly. The project focuses on five public school systems that serve low-income students in rural areas. The objective of this work is to show measurable student growth and create a positive learning and teaching environment for young people and educators.

Measurable goals and objectives of Service Delivery:

- An increase in the percentage of NCLB targets met
- An improvement in the performance of each subgroup aggregated at the district level
- An increase in the number of students scoring at achievement Levels III and IV in the district's schools
- An increase in the number of students successfully graduating from high school

Other objectives include:

- Assisting the central office to support schools more effectively, efficiently, and equitably so that all schools are on track to meet state and federal accountability goals
- Assisting districts and schools in making data-driven decisions to improve student achievement
- Conducting a needs assessment and providing the support and guidance through regional roundtables
- Assisting districts and schools in developing:
 - greater understanding of the significance of planning
 - greater knowledge of leadership and the roles of central office staff and school leaders
 - greater knowledge of the tools/processes used in monitoring instruction and increased ability to effectively monitor instruction
 - increased ability to use data strategically to establish district instructional priorities

-increased ability to align resources and activities to support priorities.

In support of local school and district improvement efforts, NCDPI annually allocates 1003(a) funds to LEAs to provide additional resources for schools, which have been identified for School Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring. Funds will be allotted based on approval of an application for School Improvement (PRC105) funds submitted by the LEA or charter school on behalf of schools participating in Title I School Improvement. The application process includes a review of school level needs, the revision of school improvement plans aligned to requirements in Section 1116(b)(3), and requirements for parent notifications.

Additionally, NCDPI allocates 1003(g) funds to LEAs to provide assistance for schools, which have been identified for Corrective Action or Restructuring and have shown progress in improving student performance. Funds will be allotted based on approval of an addendum to the application for School Improvement (PRC105) funds submitted by the LEA or charter school on behalf of schools participating in Title I School Improvement. Schools eligible for funding are selected by the SEA based on Title I school improvement status and progress made in improving student performance.

Title I staff approves the applications for funding and monitors the use of funds on an annual basis. Efforts to support specific schools are coordinated through the Regional Roundtables and target areas including budgeting and resource allocation aligned to specific identified needs.

State administrative funds provided with 1003(a) and 1003(g) are utilized for leveraging the statewide system of support. Examples of initiatives supported with these funds include:

- Balanced Leadership training - Mid-Continent Research Education Laboratory (McREL)
- Developing a Framework for Action - University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Center for School Leadership
- Curriculum Alignment - NCDPI staff
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment - Cambridge Education

Continuous Coordination, Communication, and Collaboration

Although in 2007-2008, the new model focused efforts on two LEAs serving 25 schools, an additional 166 schools were served as part of previous assistance efforts. While the old model is phased out over the next two years of project commitment, NCDPI will expand the Comprehensive Support model to include four additional LEAs, including a total of 74 schools being served with the most intensive transformation services. The District and School Transformation Division provided the coordination of 105 professional development sessions in the summer of 2008. Leveraged efforts of the Reg

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	197,750
Applied to transfer	5,210
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	4,490

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 5,620,154
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

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 options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level 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.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	50
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a 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.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	99,674
Applied for supplemental educational services	16,478
Received supplemental educational services	14,871
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,931,887
Comments: Amount has been updated.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) 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. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	77,690	75,989	97.8	1,701	2.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	8,472	8,363	98.7	109	1.3
Low-poverty schools	11,792	11,719	99.4	73	0.6
All elementary schools	41,343	40,943	99.0	400	1.0
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	6,568	6,127	93.3	441	6.7
Low-poverty schools	10,326	10,060	97.4	266	2.6
All secondary schools	36,347	35,047	96.4	1,300	3.6
Comments:					

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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.

Full day, self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 were 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 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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

In the table 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.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	11.8
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	13.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	58.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	16.3
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Expired License, No Payroll or License on file

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	6.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	24.6
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	65.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	3.8
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Expired License, No Payroll or License on file

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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	77.7	40.2
Poverty metric used	% free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	62.9	30.2
Poverty metric used	% free and reduced lunch	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in 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 in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	114,620
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	113,011
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

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	95,167
Hmong	2,549
Vietnamese	1,841
Arabic, Egyptian	1,675
Korean	1,225

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	105,423
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,611
Total	107,034
Comments: Did not test: expelled 1, refused 516, did not attend 373, cognitive disability 257, transferred prior to test 464.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3,778
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3.5
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	101,713
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,543
Total	103,256
Comments: Did not test: Refused: 505; Did not attend: 363; Severe cognitive disability: 254; Transferred prior to test: 420; Other(expelled): 1	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, 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.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	61,664	60.5
ELP attainment	3,713	3.6
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 *NCLB* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Not applicable
Comments: Not applicable

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 *NCLB* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Not applicable
Comments: Not applicable

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 *NCLB* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Not applicable
Comments: Not applicable

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP 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 funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- 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
3,131	1,971	5,102
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 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
4,094	3,631	88.7	463
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,094	2,650	64.7	1,444
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 1.6.3.6.4 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 number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
304	209	68.8	95
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	85
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	85
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	38
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	7
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	17
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	17
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	7
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled 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 in 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 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 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
23,365	2,582	19

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.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education 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 in 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 and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,772
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	896

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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

* 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 (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for 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 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	80	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	76	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	72	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	59	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	77	16,057
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	81	2,149
PD provided to principals	65	1,442
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	58	1,355
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	40	1,394
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	706
Total	344	23,103

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 in the format MM/DD/YY.

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 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/13/07	9/21/07	70
Comments: We originally exclude weekends. We have included them in the number of days but started with the 13th. This resulted in a number of days of 70. If we were to use the 1st then the number of days would be 83. We are not clear on which date to use.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

Superintendents of eligible entities not responding to submission requirements in a timely manner will be contacted personally. Hopefully this will reduce the number of days of distribution by 10 business days.
--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	69.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	55.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	61.4
Hispanic	53.6
White, non-Hispanic	74.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49.4
Limited English proficient	52.1
Economically disadvantaged	65.9
Migratory students	0.0
Male	64.9
Female	73.8
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4.7
Hispanic	5.8
White, non-Hispanic	3.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8.9
Limited English proficient	2.2
Economically disadvantaged	3.4
Migratory students	3.1
Male	4.6
Female	3.2
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	190	190
LEAs with subgrants	24	24
Total	214	214
Comments: LEAs include LEA, Charters and Military		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	98	74
K	680	630
1	905	909
2	834	808
3	871	827
4	721	737
5	662	717
6	599	680
7	608	581
8	615	595
9	717	666
10	469	458
11	358	337
12	381	396
Ungraded	0	4
Total	8,518	8,419
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	491	1,066
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,995	3,428
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	3,526	3,472
Hotels/Motels	506	453
Total	8,518	8,419
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	55
K	413
1	660
2	577
3	597
4	514
5	528
6	506
7	399
8	400
9	435
10	296
11	212
12	258
Ungraded	0
Total	5,850
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	851
Migratory children/youth	27
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	73
Limited English proficient students	196
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	16
Expedited evaluations	4
Staff professional development and awareness	11
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	14
Transportation	18
Early childhood programs	4
Assistance with participation in school programs	11
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	11
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	13
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	16
Coordination between schools and agencies	13
Counseling	13
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	17
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	8
Other (optional – in comment box below)	10
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other - Other Services includes services not provided on list

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	3
School Selection	8
Transportation	10
School records	8
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	19

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Immunization count of 5 includes both Immunizations and Other Medical Records
Other Barriers count of 19 includes Other Enrollment Issues count of 9 and Other Barriers count of 10 for a total of 19

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* 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 *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,136	347
4	989	331
5	938	300
6	878	292
7	817	238
8	843	265
High School	468	230
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,137	601
4	990	490
5	938	444
6	876	357
7	811	328
8	850	361
High School	453	217
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	430
K	254
1	265
2	251
3	228
4	179
5	154
6	181
7	163
8	146
9	152
10	111
11	66
12	32
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,127
Total	4,739

Comments: During 07-08 every migrant child was placed in a K-12 grade.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina's Migrant category 1 population has declined by 999 children (17.4%).

The decrease in category 1 students is a response to multiple factors, such as:

- ? Families are settling and establishing permanent residency within North Carolina.
- ? New migrant families are seeking employment in other industries not related to agriculture.
- ? North Carolina's tobacco farms no longer attract the high number of families that followed that crop. There is a decline in the production of tobacco because of the tobacco buyout.
- ? During the years from 1997 to 2007, the number of farms in North Carolina decreased from 59,120 farms to 48,000 farms, or a decrease of 18 percent, according to the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. At the same time, the amount of land in farms decreased from 9.44 million acres to 8.8 million acres, a decline of 6 percent. Additionally, between 2003 and 2006 cash receipt from tobacco has declined 17%. On the other hand, cash receipt from food grains increased 91% and feed grains 21%, which include 22% corn increase, but these crops do not require hand labor.
- ? Changes in the MEP law interpretation have narrowed the definition of a qualifying move. The changes in MEP Guidance have also affected ID&R practices in poultry plants. The changes in the requirements for an industrial survey have limited the partnership established with poultry plants. Therefore, the numbers of identified workers/families from poultry plants has decreased significantly.
- ? The number of H2A migrant workers has decreased 56% during the last 6 years. In 2002, the total number of H2A migrant workers was 519, while in 2008 the total number was 229.
- ? Recruiters are reluctant to go out and recruit due to recent immigration laws and possible legal actions. Migrant families are reluctant to be interviewed for similar reasons.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	253
K	132
1	133
2	108
3	100
4	88
5	55
6	87
7	62
8	54
9	57
10	47
11	22
12	14
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,082
Total	2,294
Comments: During 07-08 every migrant child was placed in a K-12 grade.	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina's Migrant category 2 population has declined by 383 children (14.3 %).

The decrease in category 2 students is a response to the same factors that are in category 1.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC uses the MIS2000 system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

This is the same system used for the last reporting period.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

The child count data is collected in MIS2000 through its main two windows, COE data and Student data. The COE data is collected from the paper COE completed during the eligibility interview. From the second year of eligibility and on, the student data is collected from schools, migrant families and migrant OSY through the enrollment verification process and through the on-going process of reporting services provided to migrant children.

What data were collected?

The Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data collected is standardized for the entire state. The sections of the COE contain the following data: Section I: Legal Parent; Section II: Eligibility Data; Section III: Child/Youth Data; Section IV: Parent/Guardian/Worker Consent; Section V: Eligibility Data Certification. Data collection is done year round. All information collected in the handwritten COE is loaded into MIS2000.

Section II: Eligibility Data is used specifically to determine eligibility. The information in this section includes: The child listed moved "From" (City, State, Country) and "To" (City, State, Country); "Qualifying Arrival Date" and "Residency Date"; The child moved "With", "To Join", "On his/her own"; Qualifying worker moved to "Obtain", "Seek" or "Previous"; Qualifying Work is/was: "Temporary", "Seasonal", "Agricultural Related", "Fishing Related"; "Qualifying Activity"; "Worker's Name" and "Current Parent/Guardian".

Section III: Child/Youth data is used to enroll the child/youth in the migrant program. The information in this section includes: child/youth full name (Paternal, Maternal, First, Middle), "Generation", "Relationship to Worker", "Race", "Sex", Date of Birth, "DOB Verification", "Age", "Birth Place" (Birth City, State, Country), "Binational", "Current School", "Enrollment Date", "Enrollment Type", and "Grade".

The School Data-School History panel collects school/migrant program enrollment information. This panel contains the following enrollment data: "School Name", "Enroll Date", "Withdraw Date", "Residency Only Verification Date", "Type", "Grade", "Termination Type", and "Termination Date". This information is collected through the handwritten COE the first year of eligibility. For the second and third year of eligibility, this information is collected from schools, families, and out-of-school youth during the enrollment verification process conducted in the beginning of the school year and in the beginning of the summer period.

Services provided to migrant children are also loaded into MIS2000. This information is provided by the local migrant program to each data specialist.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

In North Carolina the COE is the legal document used to enroll migrant children into the Migrant Education Program (MEP). A North Carolina MEP recruiter or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the State Educational Agency (SEA) or by the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to conduct eligibility interviews and to complete a COE.

Each LEA develops and implements an annual Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) plan. The local ID&R plan targets the recruitment and services of: Out-of-School pre-kindergarten children; Students attending schools; Out-of-school youth. The ID&R plan will focus its intervention in three major areas: local school systems; community agencies and business; county employment opportunities.

Recruiters know seasonal timelines for specific crops and migrant activities in their counties and recruit accordingly. Migrant recruitment and identification is done year round. In addition, some counties have health fairs that provide services and also serve as a forum for identification and recruitment of new families.

A North Carolina MEP data specialist or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the SEA to enter data into MIS2000. The data specialist is responsible for entering each COE, MEP/school enrollment information, and services provided into MIS2000.

The MEP/School enrollment information is verified every year, twice a year (regular school term and summer term), by the data specialist and recruiter with schools, migrant families, and/or Out-of-School youths through the "Enrollment Verification" process. This process verifies eligibility/services and residency of every migrant child in the state. Every year, the child is re-enrolled in the migrant program if the child is still eligible or is receiving services after the end of eligibility and if he/she is still residing in the LEA.

On an on-going basis LEAs report into MIS2000 all services provided to migrant children paid in part or whole with migrant funds. The information is provided by the recruiter, tutor, or service coordinator to the data specialist, who keeps this data updated into MIS2000.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

The COE is reviewed by the LEA MEP COE reviewer to verify that based on the recorded data, the child/youth is eligible for MEP services.

Once the COE is signed by the COE reviewer, the data specialist enters the data to his/her local database in the MIS2000 software.

The Enrollment Verification process is done twice a year. First, in the beginning of the regular school year and then, in the beginning of summer. After each child's eligibility/services and residency in the LEA is verified, the child's re-enrollment information is entered by the data specialist into MIS2000.

Services provided to migrant children are uploaded into MIS2000 on an on-going basis.

The data collected from each LEA MEP is then uploaded to the state migrant server. This server maintains the statewide migrant database, which is then used to generate the Migrant Child Count and Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Participant migrant counties have access to search and download students from the state server. Each county is responsible for maintaining and updating COEs and their databases with school history information, credit accrual, test data, health, supplemental programs, student profile and family data. Data collected from COEs is loaded to the migrant server in its entire form. The upload process to the state server is maintained all year long.

Data specialists are required to enter COEs and school enrollment information into MIS2000 within 2 weeks after the day the families are interviewed. Data specialists are instructed to upload any data changes in their local databases to the state server the same day changes are made. School enrollments for students identified in any previous terms coincide with regular school enrollments. In North Carolina, schools typically start late August and end in mid June. Summer enrollment begins in mid June and depending on the length of summer school. Withdrawals are done on or before August 31. The data manager runs a preliminary report in the middle of September to confirm

the activities done by each LEA. The report is given to each county for comparison of data between the state server and local databases. LEAs have two (2) weeks to verify the preliminary report and to modify or update their data. A copy of the state database is created by the data manager at end of September and used to generate the final Child Count and Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each LEA MEP data specialist enters eligible migrant children data into their local copy of the MIS2000 software. The data specialist keys COEs into the MIS2000 software from a handwritten COE (hard copy). Data from the hard copy is entered item by item into the software and it is checked by the reviewer. This reviewer is typically a director or program coordinator. The data specialist is able to print a COE from MIS2000 to be filed along with the handwritten COE as the legal document. COEs are an electronic document with a hard copy backup.

A unique identification number is created for each migrant student in MIS2000. Before entering any new student, the software assists users to do a student search. This feature prevents users from duplicating students. Any duplicates that are created by mistake can be identified by running local reports that check for potential duplicated records. Records can be matched by checking same DOB, close DOB, Matching DOB + Last Name or First Name, Matching DOB Last Name + First Name, or Matching DOB or Last + First Name.

Data specialists were instructed to run all the reports that find potential duplicates six times during the 07-08 year. The reports were sent to the state office and duplicate records were merged into one. The criteria used to match duplicates are: find the same student's last name, student's first name, middle initial, DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name. The merge job is done in the state migrant server and then propagated to the LEAs with duplicate records.

Uploads are done frequently to the state database to synchronize databases with the state migrant server. COE data is loaded to MIS2000 within 2 weeks of identifying students. Data entry personnel upload data to the state server as soon as changes are made to the LEA MEP database in order to keep the rest of the state with the latest student information available. In addition, frequently uploading allows North Carolina to recover local database information in case of hard drive failure at the LEA.

Once data is entered into MIS2000 it is available to be used, edited and deleted by the LEA MEP. After uploading changes to the server, data is available at state level for the same purposes. Every time that new information need to be added or current information need to be modified, the data specialist access to the COE or Student record in MIS2000 and update the data as needed. Records can be accessed by student Id, COE Id, student name, parents' name, district, school, birthday, or birth city. When the record is uploaded to the server, the updated data is available at the state level.

LEAs are required to conduct an enrollment verification process every year, twice a year (it is part of the ID&R plan components). LEAs develop and implement their own procedure. The most common practice is to conduct enrollment verification during the first months of the new school year for K-12 migrant students. Enrollment verification for OS migrant students, pre-k or youth, takes place throughout the year, usually during the peak season. A second verification is done during summer.

The data specialist runs the enrollment verification report from MIS2000 and gets all students that resided in his/her LEA during the past period. For K-12 students, the data specialist contacts schools to get enrollment information on students that are still in school. If the student is enrolled in the school and is still eligible or receiving MEP services, a new school history line is added to the student's record in MIS2000 and the student information is updated if needed. If the student is not enrolled in school or he/she is an OS pre-k or youth, the recruiter contacts the family to verify they are still in the county. The recruiter reports the findings to the data specialist, who will make the needed changes in the student's record in MIS2000, for example, enroll date, withdrawal date, type of enrollment, grade, address, family information, etc.

NCMEP implemented a new procedure to verify that the enrollment verification was done in each of our LEAs during the 07-08 year. This new procedure consisted of asking each LEA to submit to NCMEP the list of students whose enrollment was verified, including the date the verification was done and the outcome from the verification, for example, re-enrolled, moved, eligibility expired, turned 22, graduated, etc.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's Category 2 data was collected and maintained in the same way as the category 1 data was done.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children who were between age 3 through 21

The student's age must be between 3 and 21 years during the reporting year. MIS2000 computes the fields "Student ThirdBDay" is less than the end date of the report period and the "Student Twenty.SecondBDay" is greater than the start date of the reporting period.

A child will be counted if they turn 3 or 22 during the reporting period.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)

The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the beginning of the reporting period.

The Qualifying Arrival Date must be equal to or greater than 09/01/04 and be within 36 month of the Residency date.

The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the date qualifying the student (i.e. Enroll, Residency Verification, or Residency dates). The exceptions are Withdraw and Supplemental Program End dates. (Withdraw is defined as ending an enrollment period in a school history line). In MIS2000 the supplemental program section has a field named "End Date". This date can be the same as the Withdraw date from a history line, but it can stand on its own if the Local Educational Agency wants to end a supplemental program before they are withdrawn from a school history enrollment line. End of Eligibility is not the same as Program End Date. End of Eligibility means the student has ended the 36 months of eligibility, has graduated, or has died.

A child will be counted in the A1 count if the qualifying arrival date plus 36 months is equal or greater than the beginning of the reporting period and if any of the following dates falls between the reporting period range: enroll date, withdraw date, supplemental program start date, supplemental program end date, or residency only verification date. Also, the interview date has to be before or equal to the last date of the reporting period.

A child will be counted in the A2 count if in addition to the criteria for the A1 count the child's end of eligibility is equal to or after the beginning of the summer program and if the child's summer services were paid in whole or part with MEP funds.

For this purpose, the reporting period for the A1 count and for Intersession in the A2 count goes from 09/01/07 to 08/31/08. The reporting period for Summer in the A2 count goes from 06/01/08 to 08/31/08.

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)

For a child to be counted, one of the following dates must be between 09/01 and 08/31 of the reporting year: Residency Verification, Enroll, Withdraw, Supplemental Program Start or End date. Enrollment means the student has a school history line in MIS2000 showing enrollment in a school or in the migrant program (for out-of-school children). Supplemental Programs are defined in North Carolina as services above and beyond the basic educational programs provided by the local school district. Students who were resident in North Carolina for at least one day during the reporting period and who have activity in MIS2000 in any of the fields listed above will be counted in category 1 count.

Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term

For a child to be counted in category 2 count the enrollment type must be either: summer, intersession or participant. Any of these three can be paid in whole or in part with migrant funds. Summer term is defined as any organized academic program by the school district during 06/01 and 08/31 of the reporting period. Intersession term is defined as any organized intersession program by the school district in a year round school. Enrollment as intersession can occur any time between 09/01- 08/31 of the reporting year. Summer participants are defined as children receiving supplemental programs either as services or basic educational programs provided by the local school district during 06/01 - 08/31. Children served as participants include out of school youth or children that are not currently enrolled in a Regular or Summer school program.

For a child with a summer or participant enrollment type to be counted, one of the following dates must fall within the specified summer time frame (default is 06/01 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date. Children in schools whose regular term program ends after June 1 are not included in this count. The default summer enrollment date begins after the end of the regular program.

For a child with an intersession enrollment type to be counted, one of the following dates must fall within the specified intersession time frame (default is 09/01 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date.

Students who were residents in North Carolina for at least one day and have eligibility during the summer/intersession reporting period, and have supplemental services received for at least one day during the summer/intersession reporting period, and MIS2000 confirms activity

in any of the fields named above will be counted in category 2.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

Each student is counted only one time for the state regardless of the number of school history lines on the student's record for the state.

Migrant children are assigned a unique ID. Throughout the year duplicate records are merged in to one to make sure there are no duplicates in the state and local database. Student's duplicate records are merged if the student's last name, student's first name, student's middle initial, student's DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name match more than one record.

The data manager runs the Potential Duplicate Students report to find students with more than one record among different LEAs. If the six fields named above match, the records are merged. If any of those fields are different, the data manager contacts each LEA involved with the duplicated records to verify the information.

If the student has been in more than one LEA during the same reporting period, the student is counted in the last LEA he resided during that time.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's Category 2 count was generated using the same system from the Category 1 count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The N.C. MEP ID&R quality control system includes the following components that address child eligibility before the data is entered into MIS2000:

1. Using a Standardized Certificate of Eligibility (COE)

N.C. MEP uses a standardized COE. The COE has been revised as needed to reflect changes in eligibility law interpretation.

A guide including instructions on how to complete the COE is also available for training and reference purposes.

N.C. MEP requires a handwritten COE for all enrollments. The recruiter's signature indicates that he or she gathered the data directly from the parent, guardian or youth in a face-to-face interview. An MIS2000 electronic COE is also kept for all N.C. MEP students.

2. Training

A N.C. MEP recruiter or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the SEA or by the LEA to conduct eligibility interviews and to complete a COE. The LEA must inform the SEA of any new recruiter or any other assigned person trained to recruit in the LEA.

The SEA MEP staff provides training at three different levels:

One-on-one - Upon the LEA request to the SEA, the statewide recruitment coordinator, state data manager, or both will provide one-on-one basic training to new recruiters and data specialists.

By service area - Service area meetings are conducted three times a year during the fall, winter and spring. The agenda of these meetings includes training on ID&R and data collection.

Statewide - Once a year, statewide training is provided to all NC MEP staff on ID&R and data collection. The state also sponsors a statewide MEP conference that includes sessions on ID&R and data collection.

List Server - Year round, serve as a forum for follow up training questions.

3. Determining Accuracy of Written Eligibility Documentation

The LEA must assign an authorized and qualified MEP staff member to review and sign each COE. The COE reviewer must be a person other than the recruiter/interviewer who originally made the eligibility determination.

The COE reviewer must sign each COE. His or her signature certifies that the COE was reviewed and that he/she verified, based on the recorded data, that the child or youth is eligible for MEP services.

A COE should be included in the MIS2000 software only when the COE includes all the information necessary to verify the child or youth's eligibility.

4. Resolving Eligibility Questions

Each LEA establishes its own process for resolving eligibility questions, which establishes the order in which MEP staff should be contacted when questions arise. It usually includes three components: reviewing written documentation on eligibility, discussing any questions with local MEP staff (the local COE reviewer or the director) and consulting the ID&R coordinator or data manager. SEA staff is available as needed by phone, e-mail, list serve, or by visiting the site.

The process for resolving eligibility questions must be included in the local ID&R plan.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State-level re-interviews:

The SEA conducts annual MEP monitoring visits to selected LEAs, which include an ID&R re-interviewing component. This procedure was

implemented during the 2004-2005 school year.

The goal of each monitoring visit is to re-interview 10% or, if possible, 10 migrant children, whichever is greater, of the LEAs previous year's A1 count. Due to time and human resource constrictions, this goal is not reached most of the times. The re-interviews are conducted by the state ID&R coordinator or by the state program specialist.

To conduct the re-interviews, three (3) random samples, with 20 children each (60 children in total), are taken from the system for each LEA. The number of randomly selected children is greater than the number of children to be re-interviewed in case some of the children randomly selected have left the LEAs by the time the re-interview is done. If a child selected in the random sample is not residing in the LEA, the next child on the list is verified.

Eleven LEAs have been monitored during the 07-08 school year. Re-interviews specification and outcomes are shown on the following table:

Re-interview

LEA	Date	06-07 A1 Count	#children re-interviewed	#childrennot eligible
LEA 30	10/02/07	290	7	1
LEA 18	10/09/07	102	6	0
LEA 35	10/10/07	203	5	0
LEA 33	11/19/07	370	5	0
LEA 45	12/06/07	260	3	0
LEA 07	01/22/08	90	5	2
LEA 11	01/29/08	204	5	0
LEA 14	03/12/08	303	5	0
LEA 08	03/17/08	111	5	0
LEA 31	05/01/08	103	5	0
LEA 17	06/30/08	116	3	0
Total		2152	54	3

All these children have been removed from the state and local database.

In the 06-07 monitoring, 28% of the children that were interviewed were found ineligible. In the 07-08 monitoring, 6% of the children that were interviewed were found ineligible.

Local level re-interviews:

Re-interviewing workers/families at the local level was highly recommended by the SEA during the 06-07 year, but it was a LEA's decision to conduct this procedure. LEAs were not required to submit a formal report to the state office, but they have to report children who were found not eligible during re-interview.

Re-interviews at the local level are mandatory for the 07-08 year and thereafter. Once a year, each LEA will have to randomly select and re-interview 5% or 5 students, whichever is greater, of the previous year's A1 count.

According to the LEAs notification during the 07-08 funding year, 8 migrant children in 16 LEAs were found not eligible during re-interviews compared to 06-07 LEAs notification where 70 children in 8 LEAs were found ineligible. These students were removed from the state and local database upon notification.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. Before adding a student to each local database a search is done at the state server to avoid duplicate records. Six times a year each LEA runs reports that allow it to check for possible duplicated students. The criteria used are: same student's last name, student's first name, student's middle initial, student's DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name. Two records or more matching these criteria will be considered duplicates. Duplicates are merged into a single record once the state database manager executes the merge job from the state server. The job does not run automatically based on the description of the matching fields. Individual COEs are checked by the data specialist to ensure the merge report names match respective hard copies of COEs and that we are not deleting students by mistake. In addition, the data specialist makes sure the fields for the merge criteria are the same in any records found to be duplicated. School history is not checked in the determination of duplicated records but histories from both records are kept in the merged record.

2. Throughout the year the state MEP take two more steps to verify accuracy of data in MIS2000:

1. Monitoring visit: during state monitoring visits, one of the MEP data manager's tasks is to verify that data in the system is accurate and updated. This process is done by talking to the data specialist and by visually revising a random sample of student's records. Talking to the data specialist allows us to know how data is being entered into the system and the knowledge of key concepts. Revising records in the system allow us to verify if data is accurate and updated. Some of the data monitored during this process are: school history, test, credit accrual, family, supplemental programs, and eligibility data. The COE Comments Report is also used to verify eligibility data in COEs.

2. Site visit: the state MEP data manager visits each LEA as needed and by the LEA request. During this visit the data specialist has the

opportunity to expound his/her concerns in regard to the data and solve doubts. At the same time, the data manager has to opportunity to verify how the data is being entering into MIS2000 by talking to the data specialist, visually revising records in the system, and running reports.

3. The N.C. MEP ID&R quality control system includes the "Monitoring through MIS2000 Reports" component to address data quality after it is entered into MIS2000:

MIS2000 offers the option to develop different reports to verify the accuracy of data entered into the system. This procedure can be accomplished at the state or local level.

This component of the quality control system was required during the 07-08 year. The SEA uses these reports for training purposes and monitoring visits (both formal and informal visits).

The MIS2000 reports used for quality control purposes are:

COE Comments report: This report determine if the data entered meets eligibility requirements on issues such as: qualifying families under "seeking", "previous," or "temporary"; accuracy of the qualifying activity and qualifying arrival date; time between school enrollment and MEP enrollment.

COE Review Up to Date report: This report determines if the COE was entered into the MIS2000 database within two weeks from the date the family was interviewed.

4. In addition to those reports, the state has implemented the Enrollment Verification Procedure since this 07-08 year. LEAs are required to run this report from the system, verify the eligibility and residency of every child in the report, and to re-enroll them in MIS2000 if they meet the requirements. In this way, this report helps LEAs in verifying that only children who need to be re-enrolled are re-enrolled and that every child who has to be re-enrolled is re-enrolled.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. A copy of the state database is made before getting the final counts from the system. In this way, if the counts need to be obtained again, they will be gotten from the same data. In NC this process is called "freezing the data". Before freezing the data, the state data manager gets the preliminary category 1 and 2 counts from the state server. These counts are sent to each LEAs for comparison. Each LEA is instructed to get the same preliminary counts from the local database, compare the local counts to the state counts, and correct the students' records or report to the state any discrepancy between the local and state counts.

2. Also, the preliminary category 1 and category 2 counts are manually revised at the state level for possible duplicate records. If duplicate records are found, they are merged into one record and the counts are obtained again from the system.

3. After freezing the data, the final category 1 and 2 are taken from the system. Because there is a lapse in time of approximately one month between when the data is frozen and when the counts are submitted to ED, these counts are reviewed one more time. In this way, every duplicate record merged or student deleted from the server after freezing the data is removed from the final file.

4. Finally, some random students are selected from the counts and their records are reviewed in MIS2000. This action allows us to make sure that every child who is being counted meets the categories criteria.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC will take the following actions to improve the accuracy of our MEP eligibility determinations:

1. Focus on training for interviewing and re-interviewing, and assist programs in collaborating with other nearby programs to carry out re-interviewing.

2. Develop a standard questionnaire for re-interviews and use ConQIR materials to increase consistency.

3. Work closely with recruiters to refine skills in interviewing and determining eligibility.

4. Develop online training reviews to keep skills fresh through continued practice with difficult eligibility questions.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC MEP does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts.

For eligibility determinations, we recommend additional training of ID&R staff regarding determinations based on previous qualifying work, since most errors are found in this category.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.