

**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 2009-10**

**NORTH CAROLINA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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) 2009-10 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
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, April 29, 2011, 3:01:34 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2009-10**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT****STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

In February 2010, the North Carolina State Board of Education (SBE) adopted Essential Standards for Science. In June 2010, the SBE adopted Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and English Language Arts. The newly adopted content standards will be implemented in 2012-13, the same year new assessments in science, mathematics, and english language arts will be operationalized.

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

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

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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.

The State is planning to develop new assessments for the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts, and new assessments aligned to Essential Standards in Science. These assessments, general and alternates, will be operational in 2012-13. The alternate assessments will include an extended content standards assessment and a modified achievement standards assessment.
---

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



**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**

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

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	80.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	20.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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 mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	788,999	781,738	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	11,333	11,183	98.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	20,443	20,298	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	214,515	211,527	98.6
Hispanic	84,516	83,765	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	426,882	423,892	99.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	95,280	92,248	96.8
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	51,200	50,747	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	403,060	398,571	98.9
Migratory students	584	577	98.8
Male	402,002	397,541	98.9
Female	386,997	384,197	99.3

**Comments:** The scores for first year *LEP* student's who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,282	19.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	48,273	52.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	22	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	19,051	20.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,199	6.8
Total	91,827	

**Comments:** The scores for first year *LEP* student's who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	789,011	784,232	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	11,333	11,227	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	20,444	20,340	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	214,518	212,536	99.1
Hispanic	84,516	83,970	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	426,887	424,995	99.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	95,285	92,655	97.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	51,201	50,878	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	403,065	399,947	99.2
Migratory students	584	576	98.6
Male	402,010	399,050	99.3
Female	387,001	385,182	99.5

**Comments:** The scores for first year LEP student's who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with English I credit are not required to be assessed on the English I EOC. The students count for participation only.

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

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

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

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	18,691	20.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	45,586	49.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	39	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	21,755	23.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,184	6.7
Total	92,255	

**Comments:** The scores for first year LEP student's who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with English I credit are not required to be assessed on the English I EOC. The students count for participation only.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	327,337	310,188	94.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,533	4,247	93.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,340	7,887	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	91,080	84,786	93.1
Hispanic	31,042	29,465	94.9
White, non-Hispanic	180,917	172,892	95.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	38,874	34,461	88.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,825	14,941	94.4
Economically disadvantaged students	156,479	147,102	94.0
Migratory students	193	181	93.8
Male	166,126	156,627	94.3
Female	161,211	153,561	95.3

**Comments:** Last year the high school scores were not included. We have included them this year. The participation at the high school level is lower than at the elementary level.

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,371	26.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,145	43.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	31	0.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,958	19.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,374	9.7
Total	34,879	

**Comments:** These numbers come from 2 different files.

**1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

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

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	119,515	97,726	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,657	1,232	74.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,990	2,718	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	31,467	21,097	67.0
Hispanic	15,179	11,704	77.1
White, non-Hispanic	62,628	56,370	90.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,559	8,652	59.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,817	10,472	75.8
Economically disadvantaged students	65,772	48,399	73.6
Migratory students	116	91	78.4
Male	61,060	49,849	81.6
Female	58,455	47,877	81.9

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	119,496	79,252	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,657	928	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,979	2,267	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	31,467	15,488	49.2
Hispanic	15,174	7,240	47.7
White, non-Hispanic	62,625	49,502	79.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,561	5,722	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,812	5,960	43.2
Economically disadvantaged students	65,768	34,909	53.1
Migratory students	115	54	47.0
Male	61,049	38,963	63.8
Female	58,447	40,289	68.9

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	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		
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is tested only in grades 5 and 8.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	116,485	96,511	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,748	1,289	73.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,964	2,719	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	30,744	21,386	69.6
Hispanic	13,696	10,768	78.6
White, non-Hispanic	62,056	56,005	90.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,057	8,742	58.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,308	5,696	68.6
Economically disadvantaged students	62,557	46,865	74.9
Migratory students	102	73	71.6
Male	59,451	48,885	82.2
Female	57,034	47,626	83.5

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	116,465	83,202	71.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,748	1,043	59.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,956	2,392	80.9
Black, non-Hispanic	30,745	16,772	54.6
Hispanic	13,684	7,569	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	62,055	51,601	83.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,060	6,318	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,305	2,962	35.7
Economically disadvantaged students	62,545	36,908	59.0
Migratory students	102	46	45.1
Male	59,440	40,837	68.7
Female	57,025	42,365	74.3

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.



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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	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		
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is tested only in grades 5 and 8.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	114,689	92,928	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,664	1,205	72.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,804	2,536	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	30,851	20,502	66.5
Hispanic	12,695	9,782	77.1
White, non-Hispanic	61,749	54,810	88.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,970	8,314	55.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,833	4,465	65.3
Economically disadvantaged students	60,932	43,994	72.2
Migratory students	82	57	69.5
Male	58,487	47,086	80.5
Female	56,202	45,842	81.6

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	114,680	81,311	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,665	957	57.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,799	2,178	77.8
Black, non-Hispanic	30,855	16,816	54.5
Hispanic	12,684	7,165	56.5
White, non-Hispanic	61,751	50,577	81.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,970	6,258	41.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,829	2,358	34.5
Economically disadvantaged students	60,923	35,426	58.1
Migratory students	82	41	50.0
Male	58,482	40,058	68.5
Female	56,198	41,253	73.4

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	114,952	79,097	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,665	993	59.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,901	2,223	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	30,853	14,717	47.7
Hispanic	12,830	7,039	54.9
White, non-Hispanic	61,773	50,637	82.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,956	7,094	47.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,992	2,642	37.8
Economically disadvantaged students	61,096	33,997	55.6
Migratory students	85	36	42.4
Male	58,619	42,208	72.0
Female	56,333	36,889	65.5

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	112,014	89,879	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,687	1,214	72.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,778	2,498	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	30,146	19,592	65.0
Hispanic	11,885	8,856	74.5
White, non-Hispanic	61,043	54,115	88.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,929	7,674	55.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,056	3,663	60.5
Economically disadvantaged students	58,197	41,171	70.7
Migratory students	75	49	65.3
Male	57,273	45,259	79.0
Female	54,741	44,620	81.5

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	112,020	84,081	75.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,687	1,083	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,776	2,277	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	30,157	17,895	59.3
Hispanic	11,876	7,322	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	61,049	52,059	85.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,935	6,089	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,051	2,315	38.3
Economically disadvantaged students	58,208	36,689	63.0
Migratory students	74	37	50.0
Male	57,279	41,610	72.6
Female	54,741	42,471	77.6

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	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		
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is tested only in grades 5 and 8.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	110,065	87,936	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,576	1,123	71.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,772	2,528	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic	30,430	20,128	66.1
Hispanic	10,955	8,119	74.1
White, non-Hispanic	60,184	52,681	87.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,386	7,098	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,036	3,676	60.9
Economically disadvantaged students	55,707	39,140	70.3
Migratory students	81	61	75.3
Male	56,123	43,788	78.0
Female	53,942	44,148	81.8

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	110,067	73,327	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,577	778	49.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,767	2,115	76.4
Black, non-Hispanic	30,445	14,549	47.8
Hispanic	10,943	5,815	53.1
White, non-Hispanic	60,187	47,205	78.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,391	4,929	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,032	1,820	30.2
Economically disadvantaged students	55,715	29,018	52.1
Migratory students	81	31	38.3
Male	56,122	36,345	64.8
Female	53,945	36,982	68.6

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	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		
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science is tested only in grades 5 and 8.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	108,672	90,890	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,586	1,177	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,722	2,527	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	30,076	21,592	71.8
Hispanic	10,618	8,379	78.9
White, non-Hispanic	59,844	53,937	90.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,668	7,261	57.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,739	3,963	69.1
Economically disadvantaged students	53,487	40,326	75.4
Migratory students	80	55	68.8
Male	55,386	45,219	81.6
Female	53,286	45,671	85.7

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	108,660	75,297	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,586	850	53.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,719	2,094	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	30,067	15,180	50.5
Hispanic	10,612	5,771	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	59,851	48,597	81.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,673	4,769	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,734	1,738	30.3
Economically disadvantaged students	53,475	29,276	54.7
Migratory students	80	31	38.8
Male	55,377	37,375	67.5
Female	53,283	37,922	71.2

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.



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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	108,832	79,050	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,584	895	56.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,790	2,269	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	30,032	15,538	51.7
Hispanic	10,761	6,462	60.1
White, non-Hispanic	59,838	50,956	85.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,649	6,060	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,861	2,479	42.3
Economically disadvantaged students	53,595	31,723	59.2
Migratory students	80	34	42.5
Male	55,450	40,826	73.6
Female	53,382	38,224	71.6

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	91,524	70,832	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,167	765	65.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,312	2,055	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	25,380	15,676	61.8
Hispanic	7,234	5,233	72.3
White, non-Hispanic	52,891	45,111	85.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,258	3,629	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,605	1,378	52.9
Economically disadvantaged students	37,489	25,125	67.0
Migratory students	28	18	64.3
Male	45,328	34,923	77.0
Female	46,196	35,909	77.7

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOC assessments were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOC assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	96,650	63,219	65.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,218	604	49.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,610	1,909	73.1
Black, non-Hispanic	26,744	13,072	48.9
Hispanic	7,719	3,914	50.7
White, non-Hispanic	55,623	41,796	75.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,665	1,925	25.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,061	562	18.4
Economically disadvantaged students	39,534	19,788	50.1
Migratory students	31	15	48.4
Male	48,055	28,374	59.0
Female	48,595	34,845	71.7

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOC assessments were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOC assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	86,404	66,828	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	998	703	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,196	1,896	86.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,901	14,450	60.5
Hispanic	5,874	4,069	69.3
White, non-Hispanic	51,281	43,983	85.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,856	3,581	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,088	996	47.7
Economically disadvantaged students	32,411	21,107	65.1
Migratory students	16	13	81.2
Male	42,558	33,538	78.8
Female	43,846	33,290	75.9

**Comments:** Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOC assessments were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOC assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	2,519	1,460	58.0
Districts	115	6	5.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 2009-10 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 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	1,270	757	59.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,132	670	59.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	138	87	63.0
<b>Comments:</b> 1270 Title I schools are correct.			

**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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
165	6	3.6
<b>Comments:</b> # Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10 is 165. Charter schools were left off the original submission. PSC received new list that includes the charter schools on 12/16 and they will populate the count upon the re-submission window of CSPP I.		

#### 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 2010-11 (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)<sup>1</sup>)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<sup>1</sup> 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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	58
Extension of the school year or school day	19
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	17
Replacement of the principal	8
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	18
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	54
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	10
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	2
Other major restructuring of the school governance	41
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

Learning Communities: Teachers focus on students with disabilities in mathematics to promote a continuum of learning for grades K-5. An effective cycle of curriculum/instruction/assessment was created along with developmentally appropriate practices that are age, individually and culturally appropriate. Grade configurations were restructured to K-1, 2-3, 4-5, with an Academy Leader (from the LEA) assigned to each configuration. The Academy Leader leads efforts in the curriculum/instruction/assessment cycle, models teaching strategies, provides coaching and co-teaching; and facilitates accountability data discussion. These leaders are an integral part of the individualized support needed by teachers to effect instructional change. To support this program, a parent engagement model has been incorporated around the Teaching the Whole Child philosophy. Attention to the cognitive, social/emotional and physical domains of child development have been targeted. Parent Academies encourage parents to become a positive force in this development as they provide training to assist parents in working with each child.

Academy Leaders /Instructional Teams - The restructuring plan establishes instructional teams within the school setting across grade levels/subject areas. The instructional team conferences on a daily/weekly schedule with a configuration that includes the Teacher (T), Grade Level Teacher Teams (GLTT), Instructional Facilitator (IF), Principal (P), and Director (D). Weekly meetings take place using various support personnel and interview protocols. The protocols to be used are aligned with the Student Growth Indicator.

Total Quality Teaching and Learning (TQL) - Model is used to administer the revised school improvement and restructuring plans that focus on Professional Learning Communities. Teams implement and monitor initiatives (validated best practices) needed to meet academic standards for all subgroups. Efforts focus on teaching and learning, as well as leadership development.

Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) - A restructuring governance arrangement implementing a magnet school for math and science. The plan includes a clearly defined management protocol, activities aligned to state and national standards, enhanced math and science instructional strategies and professional development geared toward magnet curricula.

Middle School Turnaround Model - A governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms to improve student academic achievement. With assistance from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), the LEA/School plan includes initial assessment, professional development for leadership and instructional improvement, targeted strategic planning through the NCDPI "Framework for Action", and leadership coaching. A leadership coach was contracted through the Leadership Group for the Carolinas (LGC) to provide on-site assistance to the principal and to act as an advocate on behalf of the school.



## 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<sup>2</sup> 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 identified for improvement were reviewed as part of the screening process within the statewide system of support to determine districts that would receive the most intensive support from the state. All 34 districts identified for corrective action were required to utilize a portion of the LEA Improvement reservation to participate in a two-day training focusing on Leveraging Leadership to support planning for improved teaching and learning in the schools. Districts sent teams of five comprised of school administrators and teacher leaders within the school. Participants were surveyed to determine how the state could continue to expand support for districts in improvement.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	34
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 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	1	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	09/10/10
---	----------

### 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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

#### 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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

*Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

*States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	130,088	128,920
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	95,591	91,385
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	73.5	70.9
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	130,069	128,790
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	75,165	70,582
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	57.8	54.8
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	204
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	178

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	253
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.

**Comments:** Due to the limited amount of space provided above, NC was directed to submit table 1.4.8.3 separately. ED has placed this file/table next to the state's CSPR report and SINI and DINI files.

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



**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.

As part of the Statewide System of Support, district and school initiatives are the focus of strategic planning for identifying priorities for all schools with local needs. Effective strategies are identified through monitoring and technical assistance requests throughout the year. Successful schools are invited to share best practices in venues such as regional meetings, Statewide meetings, and State conferences on an annual basis through interactive sessions and panel discussions. With the inclusion of new data collection elements in the Consolidated Federal Data Collection system, these data will be analyzed to further assist with identifying schools that are improving based on successful implementation of specific strategies.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds****1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:**

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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



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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State provides technical assistance to LEAs to assist with the plan development. Technical assistance is offered through various venues including, Title I Regional Meetings, Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA) meetings, and webinars. Sessions conducted in 2009-10 include the following:

- March 4, 2010 - RESA Meeting, Kenansville, NC.
- March 9, 2010 - Statewide Webinar for Title I Directors
- March 10, 2010 - Statewide Webinar for LEAs with Tier I and Tier II Schools
- March 15, 2010 - RESA Meeting, Pinehurst, NC
- March 16, 2010 - RESA Meeting, Clemmons, NC

Resources are used to support the application review process and monitoring requirements to include contracting with outside experts to review applications and monitoring the SIG funded schools. Funds are utilized to enhance the Consolidated Federal Data Collection system to include required SIG data reporting elements. Funds are also used to increase support services for LEAs determined to have low capacity for implementing interventions. DPI will develop and facilitate a Title I teacher leadership program in order to:

- Provide priority for training to (1) districts with low-capacity and receiving SIG funds; (2) districts receiving SIG funds, and (3) other districts within each region; facilitate training in collaboration with Cambridge Education;
- Develop technology delivery plan (e.g., Skype lessons being taught to other classrooms in the LEA, region, etc.);
- Coordinate and calibrate the efforts of teacher leaders throughout the period of implementation with specific fidelity checks to ensure availability of high quality professional development statewide through periodic meetings and professional development as indicated and to ensure appropriate support is provided in the implementation of the SIG intervention models for those schools;
- Develop and implement a program evaluation for the services provided annually; and
- Coordinate support for districts and schools with the District and School Transformation division through Regional Roundtables, the Educator Recruitment and Development division, and Title I Consultants.

**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 2009-10 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. Part of annual deliverables for regional leads include developing and conducting School Improvement institutes with priority given to Title I schools in improvement status.

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 prioritize and customize the support.

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	224,944
Applied to transfer	7,864
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	7,684
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 3,822,907

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	16

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	169,273
Applied for supplemental educational services	34,510
Received supplemental educational services	30,125
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 19,163,641
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	78,824	76,859	97.5	1,965	2.5
All elementary classes	39,727	39,323	99.0	404	1.0
All secondary classes	39,097	37,536	96.0	1,561	4.0

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
---

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

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

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

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

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

	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	4.8
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	40.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	21.6
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Expired License, No Payroll or License on File

	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)	33.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	39.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	7.8
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Expired License, No Payroll or License on File



**1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used**

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	8,895	8,787	98.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	10,578	10,481	99.1
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,330	2,126	91.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	12,397	11,931	96.2

1.5.3.1 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.

**1.5.3.1** 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	82.9	46.6
Poverty metric used	Per guidance Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. 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. 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.	
Secondary schools	66.4	37.0
Poverty metric used	Per guidance Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. 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. 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.	

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

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).
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, Chinese, French, German, Japanese
<u>No Response</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish, French
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>No Response</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No Response</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Dual language programs are Two-way immersion programs. Co-teaching is also an ESL program model.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	119,973
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	110,248
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	99,380
Hmong	2,096
Arabic	1,977
Vietnamese	1,834
Chinese	1,544

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	106,132
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,681
Total	108,813

**Comments:** The total number of students in the state includes records for students at EACH LEA in which they enrolled during the school year, per EDEN x141. The total number of students tested and not tested is restricted to one record for each student enrolled in the SEA during the spring testing window in February and March, 2010.

After completion of the spring ELP testing window, LEAs received a secure file listing "nonparticipants" with this reminder: "Non-participants were included in AMAO calculations as NOT MET". LEAs reported the following reasons for this 2.5% of students expected to participate (but did not) in annual testing: recently enrolled student was not identified in a timely manner, student withdrawal from school during the testing window, student enrollment very late in the testing window leaving no time for ELP testing, and previous coding errors that misidentified LEP status. Coding errors were corrected.

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15,688
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14.9

**Comments:**

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	97,781
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,527
Total	100,308
<b>Comments:</b> The total number of students served by Title III in the state includes records for students at EACH LEA in which they were enrolled during the school year, per EDEN x116. The total number of students tested and not tested is restricted to one record for each student enrolled in the SEA during the spring testing window in February and March, 2010.	
After completion of the spring ELP testing window, LEAs received a secure file listing "nonparticipants" with this reminder: "Non-participants were included in AMAO calculations as NOT MET". LEAs reported the following reasons for this 2.5% of students expected to participate (but did not) in annual testing: recently enrolled student was not identified in a timely manner, student withdrawal from school during the testing window, student enrollment very late in the testing window leaving no time for ELP testing, and previous coding errors that misidentified LEP status. Coding errors were corrected.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	12,392

**1.6.3.2.2****Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	60,680	71.1	59,234	70.00
Attained proficiency	15,269	15.6	12,565	11.80
<b>Comments:</b>				

**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).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b>





**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
14,450	3,505	17,955
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12,816	12,031	93.9	785
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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
12,864	10,668	82.9	2,196
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are 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 total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,642	2,913	80.0	729
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	87
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	44
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	87
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	66
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	55
# - 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 2008-09 and 2009-10)	27
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	27
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	12

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The Northeast Consortium, comprised of 12 LEAs is counted as one subgrantee. All members of the consortium are assigned the AMAO status that is achieved as a result of the analysis conducted on the combined student data.

**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>
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
18,454	18,136	17

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction 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 under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,690
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	476

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee 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 activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	95	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	88	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	86	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	72	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	76	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	83	10,587
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	65	1,840
PD provided to principals	65	1,007
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	643
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	12	206
PD provided to community based organization personnel	43	1,269
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>15,552</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be 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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/10	10/06/10	90
<b>Comments:</b> 85 subgrantees received funds 10/6/10. Funds were also distributed to 6 LEAs 10/21/10 and to 1 LEA 11/03/10.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Title III application approval process can be shortened by dedicating days in June and early July to this process.
--

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments:</b> NC does not have any Persistently Dangerous Schools.	



**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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	63.2
Hispanic	59.0
White, non-Hispanic	77.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	56.8
Limited English proficient	52.1
Economically disadvantaged	61.8
Migratory students	-100.0
Male	67.1
Female	76.6
<b>Comments:</b> -1 (missing) is reported correctly for Migratory students.	

**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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4.0
Hispanic	4.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3.6
Limited English proficient	3.7
Economically disadvantaged	3.3
Migratory students	3.8
Male	3.7
Female	2.7
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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	186	99
LEAs with subgrants	25	25
Total	211	124
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	75	158
K	676	1,121
1	643	1,289
2	644	1,308
3	647	1,343
4	575	1,240
5	635	1,132
6	557	1,050
7	533	969
8	477	981
9	560	1,123
10	431	677
11	410	653
12	463	649
Ungraded	0	0
Total	7,326	13,693
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	939	1,193
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	5,561	11,126
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	274	629
Hotels/Motels	552	745
Total	7,326	13,693
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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)	129
K	969
1	1,128
2	1,154
3	1,198
4	1,100
5	1,017
6	934
7	869
8	873
9	1,004
10	611
11	566
12	578
Ungraded	
Total	12,130
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	748
Migratory children/youth	25
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,898
Limited English proficient students	1,030
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	19
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	14
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	19
Transportation	23
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	17
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	17
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	13
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	19
Counseling	20
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	14
Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
School supplies	23
Referral to other programs and services	20
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	16
Other (optional – in comment box below)	16
Other (optional – in comment box below)	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**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.

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	10
School Selection	7
Transportation	13
School records	7
Immunizations	6
Other medical records	3
Other Barriers – in comment box below	8

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**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 *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	1,245	532
4	1,122	563
5	1,061	513
6	954	506
7	876	389
8	879	402
High School	420	212
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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 *ESEA* mathematics assessment.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	1,244	769
4	1,123	729
5	1,059	658
6	954	581
7	876	512
8	882	564
High School	373	225
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

**FAQs on Child Count:**

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

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



**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	741
K	251
1	335
2	299
3	302
4	242
5	224
6	192
7	175
8	174
9	185
10	137
11	75
12	68
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,044
Total	5,444

**Comments:** There were no children enrolled as Ungraded in 2009-10.

**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.

There were not any increases or decreases from last year greater than 10 percent.

**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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	278
K	109
1	160
2	141
3	147
4	105
5	96
6	101
7	90
8	80
9	78
10	56
11	38
12	33
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	657
Total	2,169
<b>Comments:</b> There were no children enrolled as Ungraded in 2009-10.	

**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.

There were not any increases or decreases greater than 10 percent.

**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.

### 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: Family Data; Section II: Child/Youth Data; Section III: Qualifying move & work; Section IV: Comments; Section V: Paren/Guardian/Spouse/Worker Signature; Section VI: Eligibility Data Certification; Section VII: Release of Records; Section VIII. OSY Pre-MEP Information. Data collection is done year round. All information collected in the handwritten COE is loaded into MIS2000.

Section II: 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), Suffix, Mother's maiden name, "Race", "Sex", Date of Birth, Age, DOB Verification, Birth Place (City, State, Country), Current School, Enrollment Date, Grade, and Residency Date.

Section III: Qualifying move & work data is used specifically to determine eligibility. The information in this section includes: The child listed moved From (District, City, State, Country) and To (District, City, State); Qualifying Arrival Date; The child moved With, To Join, or On his/her own; Qualifying worker moved in order to obtain Qualifying work, Any work, or Qualifying work but didn't find it. Qualifying work is/was: Temporary, Seasonal, Agricultural Related, Fishing Related; Qualifying Activity; Worker's Name, and Relationship to the child(ren).

The 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, Termination Date, and Immunization flag. 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 and it is entered in the Supplemental Program Panel. This panel collects Service Code, Service Name, Start Date, End Date, Funding, Schedule, and Provider.

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 at least monthly 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 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 usually runs a preliminary report in the middle of September to confirm the activities done by each LEA. For 2009-2010 data the preliminary report was run at the beginning of November. 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 Report.

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.

Regional data specialists were instructed to run all the reports that find potential duplicates four times during the 2009-10 year. 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 merging job is done in a state migrant computer dedicated to resolving duplicate records. Merges are loaded to the state server and 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 or check the school computer system (NCWISE) 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 08-09 year. This new procedure consisted of a Certification signed by the local MEP Director and Data Specialist from each LEA and submitted to NCMEP. The Certification confirmed that all children records were reviewed and that eligible children were re-enrolled in the program.

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.

N/A

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 09/01/05 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 Date). 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 range period: enroll date, withdraw date, supplemental program start date, or supplemental program end 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 09/01/09 to 08/31/10. The reporting period for Summer in the A2 count goes from 06/16/10 to 08/31/10.

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: Enroll, Withdraw, Supplemental Program Start or End dates. 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 06/16 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 06/16 - 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 06/16 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date. Children in schools whose regular term program ends after June 16 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/she 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.

N/A

### 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 provided one-on-one basic training to new recruiters and data specialists.

Service Area Meeting - A Service Area Meeting was conducted in October 2010. The agenda of that meeting included training and updates on ID&R and data collection.

Webinars - Trainings through Webinars were conducted year-round on various topics that included ID&R and Data Collection.

#### 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 after completing the COE Review Form. 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. The COE Review Form is attached to the original COE and kept on file for a period of 11 years.

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

The State ID&R Plan outlines a process for resolving eligibility questions, which establishes the order in which MEP staff should be contacted when questions arise. It includes three components: reviewing written documentation and guidance 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, or by visiting the site.

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:

ID&R Prospective Re-Interviews are conducted using a random sample of students statewide.

The goal is to re-interview 75 families. The re-interviews are conducted by the State ID&R Coordinator and by the State Program Specialist. The SEA can use the re-interviews for quality control and to identify problems early.

To conduct the re-interviews, two (2) random samples, with 76 children each (152 children in total), are taken from the system. 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 back-up list is verified.

Thirty-one LEAs were visited during the 09-10 school year. Re-interview specifications and outcomes are shown on the following table:

LEA Re-interview

Date # of children re-interviewed # of children found not eligible # of siblings not eligible

010 08/03/10 4 0 0

030 07/19/10 2 0 0

050 08/26/10 1 0 0

090 08/13/10 5 1 1

100 06/09/10 1 0 0

130 07/19/10 3 0 0

240 06/10/10 9 0 0

241 08/13/10 3 0 0

310 03/25/10 1 0 0

330 08/12/10 1 0 0

400 06/24/10 2 0 0

420 08/25/10 3 0 0

440 08/11/10 2 0 0

450 05/20/10 2 0 0

510 08/05/10 2 0 0

540 04/28/10 1 0 0

560 08/11/10 3 0 0

640 08/12/10 5 0 0

680 08/03/10 3 0 0

710 08/13/10 4 0 0

740 04/30/10 4 0 0

760 05/06/10 1 0 0

780 08/31/10 2 0 0

790 08/04/10 5 0 0

820 05/26/10 2 0 0

910 08/12/10 2 0 0

960 08/05/10 3 0 0

Total - 76 1 1

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. The 08-09 Prospective Re-Interviews found 2% of the children ineligible. The 09-10 Prospective Re-Interviews found 1.3% of the children ineligible.

Local level re-interviews and OME visit:

Re-interviewing workers/families at the local level was a requirement issued by the SEA during the 09-10 year. The Office of Migrant Education also analyzed 200 COEs.

Each LEA randomly selected and re-interviewed 5% or 5 students, whichever is greater, of the previous year's A1 count. LEAs were required to submit a Re-Interview Outcome Report to the state office.

According to the LEA's notification and OME's observations during the 09-10 funding year, 4 migrant children out of 344 students were found not eligible during re-interviews. According to the LEAs notification during the 08-09 funding year, 5 migrant children out of 214 students were found not eligible during re-interviews. Improvement has been shown if compared to the 06-07 LEAs notification where 70 children were found ineligible and 07-08 reports where 8 migrant children were found ineligible. These students were removed from the state and local database upon notification.

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. Three times a year regional data specialists run 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 they execute the merge job from the state computer dedicated to resolve duplicate problems. 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 four more steps to verify accuracy of data in MIS2000:

1. Desk Monitoring: student records are formally revised once a year. The MEP data manager verifies that data in the system is accurate and updated. This process is done by visually revising a random sample of 50 student's records. 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. Eligibility data check: every LEA verifies once a year that the eligibility information of every current family is correct. This is done by running the COE Summary Report and reviewing the data displayed there. The report shows eligibility data of current families. A formal report is sent to the state ID&R coordinator indicating corrections and action plan.

3. Site visit: throughout the year the MEP monitoring team visits LEAs and interviews local MEP staff in order to learn how they collect and enter data into MIS2000. Some reports are run from the system to verify data status and evaluate them along with local staff.

4. Ongoing basis: the state MEP data manager is available to LEAs on an ongoing basis to meet LEA needs and resolve questions. Webinars are scheduled as needed. Data manager has to opportunity to verify how data is being entering into MIS2000 by talking to data specialists, visually revising records in the system, and running reports.

3. 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.

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. 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.

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.

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 carryout re-interviewing.

2. Provide training on completing the COE Review Form and the Re-Interview Form in order to increase consistency. Update the forms according to Federal Regulations and Guidance.

3. Update the ID&R Manual and provide training to MEP Staff on its contents.

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

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

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:

- where the worker and the child(ren) do not come together ("to join")
- that refer to the worker's prior history
- of a qualifying activity
- of the residence the child(ren) moved from