

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08

TENNESSEE



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
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		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Tennessee Department of Education		
Address: 710 James Robertson Pkwy, 5th Floor Nashville, TN 37243		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Trish Kelly		
Telephone: 615-253-3168		
Fax: 615-253-5706		
e-mail: Trish.Kelly@state.tn.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Julie McCargar		
		Thursday, December 18, 2008, 10:06:50 AM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee's State Board of Education has adopted challenging content standards in science, reading/language arts, and math that are consistent with section 1111(b)(1). These standards can be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/standards/>

Tennessee has developed Alternate Achievement Standards which are directly linked to general curriculum content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. These Alternate Achievement Standards can be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment.shtml#DISABILITY>

Additionally, a review and edit to these Alternate Achievement Standards to verify alignment to the new challenging content standards in science, reading/language arts, and math is scheduled for January 2009.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading, math and science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process).

The State has revised its K-12 content standards in reading/language arts, math, and science. The State has issued an Request for Proposal and signed a contract with a test vendor to produce a new assessment for its newly revised content standards with the intention that both K-8 and new high school assessments that are aligned with the newly revised content standards will be piloted in school year 2008-09 and implemented during school year 2009-10.

Content standards for K-8 and 9-12 science, K-8 and 9-12 reading/language arts, and K-8 and 9-12 math have been revised and approved by the State Board of Education at its meeting on January 25, 2008. Tennessee's K-12 content standards are available at <http://www.state.tn.us/sbe/2008Januarypdfs/January%202008%20Agenda.pdf>.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) assessment system was implemented in Spring 2004 for all content areas: reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies. The high school test for mathematics, Gateway Math, and the high school tests for language arts, Gateway English and 11th grade writing assessment have already been implemented. Information about those tests can be found on the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/>.

Local educational agencies are involved with the development and implementation of our assessments in the following ways:

1. they approve and revise all of our criterion-referenced items;
2. they review all criterion-referenced items for bias; and,
3. they participate in the standards setting process.

The Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) is the statewide assessment program developed for all students. The TCAP Alternate Assessment (TCAP-Alt) was developed to include students with the most significant cognitive/adaptive disabilities in the statewide assessment and accountability program. The TCAP-Alt consists of one type of assessment: the portfolio assessment (PA). The IEP Team must ensure that the student meets the TCAP-Alt Participation Guidelines prior to the student's participation in the PA. In the 2005-2006 school year the PA option was revised to include alignment with academic content standards and assess the student's progress on alternate achievement standards for the student's grade level. A new RFP was released in 2008 and a contract has been signed for the TN alternate assessment for 2008-09.

In the 2004-2005 school year, an Alternate Writing Assessment (TCAP-Alt Writing) was developed and used through 2007-08. This assessment has been removed from the assessment system beginning in 2008-09.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading/language arts and math through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process).

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) Achievement Assessment for Grades 3-8 meeting the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA will be repurposed for the 2010 assessment. Revised curriculum and achievement standards for mathematics and reading/language arts will be the basis for this repurposed grades 3-8 assessment. Additionally, two new alternate assessments will be developed. An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards will be operational in 2010. An alternate assessment based on grade level standards for ESL students will be operational in 2010 as well.

The TCAP Secondary Assessment Program will be repurposed from a diploma requirement in the three Gateway Assessments (Language Arts, Math, and Science) to an End of Course (EOC) program with ten assessments as the final outcome. Algebra I, English II (with 11th grade writing) and Biology I will be the new assessments meeting the ESEA requirements for high school. Algebra II, English I, English III, Physics, Chemistry and US History will be added over the course of the new contract which will go out January 2009 using the TN RFP process. A new contract should be in place for development of these new assessments by May 2009. TN uses an embedded field test item model on its operational assessments and will have new assessments ready by Fall 2009 in Algebra I and English II. Additionally, English I, Biology I, and US History will be implemented using the same model.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process). All science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school are implemented and approved.

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) assessment system was implemented in Spring 2004 for all content areas: reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies. The high school test for mathematics, Gateway Math, and the high school tests for language arts, Gateway English and 11th grade writing assessment, and the high school test for science, Gateway Science have already been implemented. Information about those tests can be found on the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/>.

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) Achievement Assessment for Grades 3-8 meeting the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* will be repurposed for the 2010 assessment. Revised curriculum and achievement standards for science will be the basis for this repurposed grades 3-8 assessment. Additionally, two new alternate assessments will be developed. An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards will be operational in 2010. An alternate assessment based on grade level standards for ESL students will be operational in 2010 as well.

The TCAP Secondary Assessment Program will be repurposed from a diploma requirement in the three Gateway Assessments (Language Arts, Math, and Science) to an End of Course (EOC) program with ten assessments as the final outcome. Algebra I, English II (with 11th grade writing) and Biology I will be the new assessments meeting the *ESEA* requirements for high school. Algebra II, English I, English III, Physics, Chemistry and US History will be added over the course of the new contract which will go out January 2009 using the TN RFP process. A new contract should be in place for development of these new assessments by May 2009. TN uses an embedded field test item model on its operational assessments and will have new assessments ready by Fall 2009 in Biology I.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	527,614	524,194	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,273	1,266	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,878	7,852	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	138,100	136,607	98.9
Hispanic	25,177	25,033	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	354,226	352,541	99.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	65,330	64,649	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,130	11,054	99.3
Economically disadvantaged students	267,201	264,990	99.2
Migratory students	289	288	99.6
Male	271,180	269,237	99.3
Female	256,120	254,673	99.4
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,839	24.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	43,769	67.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,041	7.8
Total	64,649	
Comments: The number of Children with Disabilities participating in the Math assessments is lower than the number of Children with Disabilities with a proficiency level based on TN's accountability requirement for Out of Level testing. TN allowed LEAs/schools to test some Children with Disabilities by providing an Out of Level test to meet <i>IDEA</i> requirements. These students were not counted as participants (invalid assessment) and would receive a performance level and be counted as below proficient for performance.		

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	518,509	515,272	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,259	1,249	99.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,143	8,089	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	129,685	128,548	99.1
Hispanic	24,364	24,162	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	354,160	352,378	99.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	62,241	61,593	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,543	10,363	98.3
Economically disadvantaged students	258,758	256,667	99.2
Migratory students	284	282	99.3
Male	266,383	264,527	99.3
Female	251,815	250,465	99.5

Comments: Limited English proficient (LEP) students were counted as participants but had an exclusion that did not provide for a valid performance level.

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,916	22.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	42,820	69.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,857	7.9
Total	61,593	

Comments: The number of Children with Disabilities participating in the Reading/Language Arts assessments is lower than the number of Children with Disabilities with a proficiency level based on TN's accountability requirement for Out of Level testing. TN allowed LEAs/schools to test some Children with Disabilities by providing an Out of Level test to meet *IDEA* requirements. These students were not counted as participants (invalid assessment) and would receive a performance level and be counted as below proficient for performance.

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	521,166	517,055	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,245	1,232	99.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,174	8,118	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	131,005	129,497	98.8
Hispanic	24,638	24,444	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	355,202	352,918	99.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	61,938	61,099	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,785	10,678	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	260,085	257,461	99.0
Migratory students	290	287	99.0
Male	267,141	264,802	99.1
Female	253,702	251,967	99.3
Comments:			

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

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,851	22.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	42,270	69.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,978	8.1
Total	61,099	

Comments: The number of Children with Disabilities participating in the Science assessments is lower than the number of Children with Disabilities with a proficiency level based on TN's accountability requirement for Out of Level testing. TN allowed LEAs/schools to test some Children with Disabilities by providing an Out of Level test to meet *IDEA* requirements. These students were not counted as participants (invalid assessment) and would receive a performance level and be counted as below proficient for performance.

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,012	66,526	88.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	138	126	91.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,220	1,169	95.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,206	14,159	77.8
Hispanic	4,046	3,437	84.9
White, non-Hispanic	51,267	47,513	92.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,911	6,036	67.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,308	1,753	76.0
Economically disadvantaged students	40,377	33,537	83.1
Migratory students	56	40	71.4
Male	38,790	34,116	88.0
Female	36,179	32,371	89.5
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,934	68,982	92.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	138	124	89.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,192	1,140	95.6
Black, non-Hispanic	18,193	15,598	85.7
Hispanic	3,997	3,384	84.7
White, non-Hispanic	51,279	48,618	94.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,915	7,153	80.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,204	1,570	71.2
Economically disadvantaged students	40,322	35,454	87.9
Migratory students	56	36	64.3
Male	38,752	34,976	90.3
Female	36,138	33,967	94.0
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,924	61,109	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	137	111	81.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,213	1,094	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18,192	11,026	60.6
Hispanic	4,043	2,998	74.2
White, non-Hispanic	51,204	45,769	89.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,900	5,803	65.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,299	1,368	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	40,331	29,098	72.1
Migratory students	55	28	50.9
Male	38,739	31,595	81.6
Female	36,142	29,479	81.6
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,645	66,548	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	126	114	90.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,225	1,172	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	18,197	15,099	83.0
Hispanic	3,847	3,364	87.4
White, non-Hispanic	50,113	46,677	93.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,883	6,010	67.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,185	1,735	79.4
Economically disadvantaged students	38,997	33,394	85.6
Migratory students	47	38	80.9
Male	37,588	33,394	88.8
Female	36,016	33,121	92.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,534	67,044	91.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	126	112	88.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,190	1,122	94.3
Black, non-Hispanic	18,176	15,545	85.5
Hispanic	3,791	3,128	82.5
White, non-Hispanic	50,115	47,014	93.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,888	6,757	76.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,060	1,386	67.3
Economically disadvantaged students	38,926	33,715	86.6
Migratory students	47	34	72.3
Male	37,515	33,384	89.0
Female	35,977	33,626	93.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,545	59,607	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	125	109	87.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,212	1,062	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	18,175	10,971	60.4
Hispanic	3,839	2,666	69.4
White, non-Hispanic	50,057	44,688	89.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,872	5,474	61.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,177	1,096	50.3
Economically disadvantaged students	38,946	27,741	71.2
Migratory students	47	29	61.7
Male	37,524	30,782	82.0
Female	35,980	28,796	80.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,709	67,255	93.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	148	141	95.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,145	1,113	97.2
Black, non-Hispanic	17,718	15,700	88.6
Hispanic	3,696	3,416	92.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,907	46,800	95.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,539	6,437	75.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,553	1,317	84.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37,126	33,625	90.6
Migratory students	50	43	86.0
Male	36,676	33,992	92.7
Female	35,002	33,241	95.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,619	68,277	95.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	147	143	97.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,118	1,089	97.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,707	16,298	92.0
Hispanic	3,650	3,283	89.9
White, non-Hispanic	48,902	47,374	96.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,546	7,233	84.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,454	1,111	76.4
Economically disadvantaged students	37,057	34,362	92.7
Migratory students	49	39	79.6
Male	36,626	34,366	93.8
Female	34,962	33,885	96.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,644	59,420	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	148	135	91.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,139	1,015	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	17,705	11,088	62.6
Hispanic	3,690	2,769	75.0
White, non-Hispanic	48,867	44,338	90.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,518	5,211	61.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,548	797	51.5
Economically disadvantaged students	37,080	27,341	73.7
Migratory students	50	30	60.0
Male	36,637	30,615	83.6
Female	34,976	28,786	82.3
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,972	65,185	91.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	181	93.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,080	1,036	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17,509	15,032	85.9
Hispanic	3,405	3,015	88.5
White, non-Hispanic	48,671	45,837	94.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,276	5,701	68.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,281	928	72.4
Economically disadvantaged students	35,922	31,480	87.6
Migratory students	43	39	90.7
Male	36,441	32,825	90.1
Female	34,521	32,354	93.7
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,864	66,610	94.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	185	95.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,050	1,008	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17,485	15,700	89.8
Hispanic	3,346	2,982	89.1
White, non-Hispanic	48,677	46,645	95.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,284	6,466	78.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,160	807	69.6
Economically disadvantaged students	35,846	32,503	90.7
Migratory students	43	35	81.4
Male	36,383	33,401	91.8
Female	34,471	33,200	96.3
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,874	59,934	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	170	87.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,077	972	90.3
Black, non-Hispanic	17,474	12,246	70.1
Hispanic	3,399	2,599	76.5
White, non-Hispanic	48,618	43,872	90.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,249	4,898	59.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,278	594	46.5
Economically disadvantaged students	35,861	27,334	76.2
Migratory students	43	34	79.1
Male	36,391	30,755	84.5
Female	34,474	29,174	84.6
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72,469	65,529	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	165	93.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,048	1,017	97.0
Black, non-Hispanic	18,134	15,108	83.3
Hispanic	3,260	2,818	86.4
White, non-Hispanic	49,753	46,346	93.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,443	5,379	63.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,240	854	68.9
Economically disadvantaged students	36,084	30,816	85.4
Migratory students	31	21	67.7
Male	37,162	32,732	88.1
Female	35,288	32,781	92.9
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72,383	66,086	91.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	163	92.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,022	972	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,126	15,379	84.8
Hispanic	3,190	2,683	84.1
White, non-Hispanic	49,771	46,814	94.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,440	6,093	72.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,122	630	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	36,030	31,136	86.4
Migratory students	31	19	61.3
Male	37,106	32,832	88.5
Female	35,258	33,237	94.3
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72,359	58,960	81.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	153	86.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,048	944	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,093	11,748	64.9
Hispanic	3,251	2,321	71.4
White, non-Hispanic	49,694	43,728	88.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,414	4,536	53.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,235	541	43.8
Economically disadvantaged students	36,012	25,888	71.9
Migratory students	30	11	36.7
Male	37,093	30,184	81.4
Female	35,247	28,763	81.6
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,993	64,809	90.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	163	92.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,101	1,061	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,317	15,148	82.7
Hispanic	3,091	2,681	86.7
White, non-Hispanic	49,227	45,701	92.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,397	5,188	61.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,127	797	70.7
Economically disadvantaged students	34,747	29,357	84.5
Migratory students	30	26	86.7
Male	36,995	32,430	87.7
Female	34,978	32,362	92.5
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,883	67,725	94.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	170	95.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,075	1,039	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic	18,315	16,455	89.8
Hispanic	3,022	2,672	88.4
White, non-Hispanic	49,214	47,323	96.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,394	6,630	79.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,015	674	66.4
Economically disadvantaged students	34,662	31,447	90.7
Migratory students	27	22	81.5
Male	36,931	34,081	92.3
Female	34,932	33,625	96.3
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,857	54,307	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	142	80.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,099	933	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	18,260	10,185	55.8
Hispanic	3,081	1,945	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	49,161	41,053	83.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,352	3,650	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,120	333	29.7
Economically disadvantaged students	34,646	21,930	63.3
Migratory students	30	10	33.3
Male	36,921	27,887	75.5
Female	34,916	26,407	75.6
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	88,364	66,168	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	305	248	81.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,017	901	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	28,526	16,848	59.1
Hispanic	3,661	2,756	75.3
White, non-Hispanic	54,600	45,240	82.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,241	6,707	50.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,353	818	60.5
Economically disadvantaged students	41,703	28,236	67.7
Migratory students	30	17	56.7
Male	45,567	33,570	73.7
Female	42,675	32,520	76.2
Comments:			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,529	75,288	94.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	288	274	95.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,297	1,250	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20,468	18,437	90.1
Hispanic	2,895	2,620	90.5
White, non-Hispanic	54,374	52,521	96.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,165	7,932	78.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	791	569	71.9
Economically disadvantaged students	33,442	30,584	91.5
Migratory students	27	21	77.8
Male	40,916	37,956	92.8
Female	38,497	37,237	96.7
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	81,857	78,348	95.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	274	264	96.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,318	1,292	98.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21,606	19,646	90.9
Hispanic	3,126	2,912	93.2
White, non-Hispanic	55,326	54,048	97.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,831	8,172	83.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,017	820	80.6
Economically disadvantaged students	34,580	32,170	93.0
Migratory students	32	27	84.4
Male	41,501	39,419	95.0
Female	40,231	38,825	96.5
Comments:			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,643	1,317	80.2
Districts	136	124	91.2
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	941	764	81.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	837	668	79.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	104	96	92.3
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
139	124	89.2
Comments: Three of the 139 schools that received Title I funds are not required to calculate an AYP status because they are not accountable for students for AYP purposes: Tennessee School for the Blind, Tennessee School for the Deaf and West Tennessee School for the Deaf.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	0
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	18
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee is providing technical assistance to the 5 districts identified for improvement in a variety of ways.

First, the districts that are identified as in LEA Improvement and Corrective Action are assigned System Targeted Assistance Team (STAT) consultants to work at the district level with the district staff on improvement efforts.

Second, Tennessee requires all districts to engage in a comprehensive district improvement planning process that results in their submission of a consolidated application for their NCLB funds. This process is referred to as the Tennessee Comprehensive Systemwide Planning Process (TCSPP). All districts have been offered technical assistance on their TCSPPs in light of academic and non-academic data from school year 2007-2008. All LEAs in Improvement and Corrective Action submitted their TCSPPs for review and approval by the State in November 2008. LEAs that are identified as in improvement must ensure that they have addressed the additional components required in Title IA of NCLB for LEA Improvement.

In addition, the State monitors district expenditures to ensure that the required setaside of 10% of Title I for professional development is budgeted and expended for activities which will help the LEAs meet adequate yearly progress.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
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	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	45	5
Schools	104	42
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	07/25/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

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

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	31,549	33,560
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	24,011	23,742
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	76.1	70.7
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	24,921	25,414
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	79.0	75.7
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	75	
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	56
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	23
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	19
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<p>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
1		54	18	22	A	
2		59	20	25	A	
3		27	9	11	C	
4		73	23	32	A	
5	<p>Other strategies included:</p> <p>a) offered tutoring before and after school and on weekends;</p> <p>b) 4 week summer session on reading, language arts and math;</p> <p>c) improved student behaviors through school-wide positive behavioral supports and the addition of behavioral and family specialist positions;</p> <p>d) greater parent involvement including creation of a PTO, more collaboration with PTOs, and monthly curriculum workshops for parents; and</p> <p>e) improved school climate by upgrading facilities.</p>	66	22	30	A	
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1 and 2	43	15	19	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 1 and 3	27	9	11	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 2 and 3	26	9	11	A	
<p>Comments: Although the most common positive outcome resulting from these strategies was Outcome A -- improvement by at least 5 percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells-- other positive outcomes reported by districts included decrease in disciplinary incidents, decrease in office referrals, increase in attendance, improvement in technology education, enhanced collaboration with public library, increase in the number of community partners and increase in teacher retention due to model classrooms.</p>						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p>

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

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

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.

Tennessee shares the effective strategies listed in item 1.4.8.3 with the state's LEAs and schools in various ways. First, the state assigns one of its Exemplary Educators (EEs) through the statewide system of support to every school identified as in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. These external providers are provided specific training by the state's contractor, Edvantia, to provide technical assistance to the schools and districts. In addition, EEs meet frequently to discuss the strategies that are producing results in their assigned schools. They also have a special listserv in which they discuss these strategies with each and seek input from their fellow EEs.

Second, all districts are assigned state NCLB field service consultants to work with individual districts and their schools to implement NCLB programs effectively. This includes working with districts that have schools receiving Title I school improvement funds. While working with their schools, they share effective strategies that other schools have implemented using school improvement funds.

In addition, the State has provided two annual opportunities for districts with schools in improvement that receive funds to share their best practices with each other. First, the State annually provides an application and application process that districts with eligible schools complete to receive funds. To provide professional development to the districts on the application and the best use of the funds, the State holds a webex in which the districts share the most promising strategies that they have utilized in previous years funded by Title I improvement funds. Second, as part of the reporting process on the use of these funds, the State holds a webex for districts to understand how to report their performance and to share with each other again those strategies that have been most promising in improving student achievement that were funded by Title I school improvement funds.

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee reserved 5 percent of Section 1003(g) funds from its FY 07 grant; however, because the State did not receive the grant award for this program until January 2008, it did not utilize any of these funds until school year 2008-09. The current school year, the State is utilizing these funds for consolidated administration of NCLB programs. This includes the support of administering the Section 1003(g) funds and providing technical assistance to LEAs that receive these funds.

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

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

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All identified schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring provided with intensive support (up to 100 days) from Tennessee's Statewide System of Support through its state-funded Exemplary Educator (EEs) program. EEs are specially trained retired educators that have been selected to provide the identified schools support in areas such as: revision of their school improvement plans, input on the use of Title I school improvement funds, professional development, parental involvement, data analysis, use of time, and curriculum.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	63,894
Applied to transfer	3,398
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,857

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,064,279
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	1
Comments: LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	35,809
Applied for supplemental educational services	4,539
Received supplemental educational services	3,671
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,327,958
Comments:	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	187,787	183,608	97.8	4,179	2.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	15,504	15,209	98.1	295	1.9
Low-poverty schools	28,826	28,650	99.4	176	0.6
All elementary schools	95,235	94,188	98.9	1,047	1.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	19,658	18,517	94.2	1,141	5.8
Low-poverty schools	27,130	26,660	98.3	470	1.7
All secondary schools	92,552	89,420	96.6	3,132	3.4
Comments:					

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Both... Some LEA's list each subject at the elementary level by a separate course code and others use a single course code for all subjects at a given grade level. This varies from one LEA to another and varies by grade level. (Upper elementary grades tend to be departmentalized more often than lower elementary grades.)

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	22.0
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	70.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	8.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comments...

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	38.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	55.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comments...

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	79.3	47.0
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligible	
Secondary schools	67.8	36.6
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligible	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>No</u>	Dual language	
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>No</u>	Transitional bilingual	
<u>No</u>	Developmental bilingual	
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</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.

A few LEAs also use a push-in or inclusion model for ELLs.

TN is an English only state and does not have bilingual education for the ELLs.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	25,449
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	28,244
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	19,993
Arabic	1,055
Vietnamese	547
Kurdish	363
Chinese	335

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Taken from the spring 2008 ELDA census provided through assessment contractor, Measurement Inc.

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	25,449
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	656
Total	26,105
Comments: Because of migrant student fluctuation, incomplete assessments, student enrollment changes, student migration, the entire ELL population was not assessed during the testing window.	

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	6,073
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	23.3
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	25,256
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	651
Total	25,907
Comments: The discrepancy relates to different reporting periods. The reporting period was school year for N116, which provided the count for 1.6.2.2. The reporting period for 1.6.3.2.1 was the ELDA test period during March 2008.	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	10,700	78.3
ELP attainment	5,997	52.5
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,845	3,933	9,778
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,010	3,680	91.8	330
Comments:			

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

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

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,518	6,204	95.2	314
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,018	4,822	80.1	1,196
Comments:			

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

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

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	60
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	36
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	59
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	39
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	58
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	5
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	2
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
15,815	5,997	2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	725
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	363

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.

TN is growing with the ELL population about 10% per year. It is assumed that the teacher pool will need to grow accordingly.

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

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **# Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	61	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	54	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	51	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	35	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	47	
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	56	8,308
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	53	1,828
PD provided to principals	44	757
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	50	796
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	38	1,075
PD provided to community based organization personnel	24	885
Total	61	13,649

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development topics included data management, data collection, SIOP, Special Education issues for ELLs, site visits, differentiation, teaching strategies.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/08	07/18/08	11
Comments: The State awards the money when received. When the money is set up on TN's Federal Accounting Consolidated Tracking System (FACTS), it is available to the LEAs within 7-11 days.		

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of TN is working to move the money quicker than the expected 7-11 days. Occassionally the money reaches the LEA quicker than the expected 7 day minimum.
--

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	76.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	71.6
Hispanic	73.1
White, non-Hispanic	85.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	78.2
Female	85.5
Comments: We cannot yet send graduation rates for Children with Disabilities, LEP student, disadvantaged students or migratory students because we don't yet have 4 years of individual student data. We should have it by 2009-10.	
Our Native American population is very small. Because of this the graduation rate bounces around a bit.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Starting in 2006-07 we started collecting individual data on student progress through high school, compiling a 2009-10 cohort, which we will use as the denominator of the graduation rate in 2009-10.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5.3
Hispanic	4.7
White, non-Hispanic	2.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	3.5
Female	2.5
Comments: We did not divide out Disabled, LEP, Disadvantaged or Migratory students in 2006-07.	
We will have breakouts for LEP and disabled students for 2008-09	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	125	125
LEAs with subgrants	15	15
Total	140	140
Comments:		

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41	261
K	162	829
1	158	748
2	145	763
3	130	580
4	108	534
5	107	501
6	97	417
7	75	407
8	85	342
9	72	441
10	55	293
11	59	211
12	60	189
Ungraded	10	151
Total	1,364	6,667
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	147	1,516
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,046	4,416
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	69	159
Hotels/Motels	102	576
Total	1,364	6,667
Comments:		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	262
K	815
1	744
2	669
3	582
4	537
5	505
6	407
7	394
8	330
9	434
10	290
11	200
12	167
Ungraded	51
Total	6,387
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	205
Migratory children/youth	22
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	742
Limited English proficient students	238
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	14
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	13
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	12
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	14
Counseling	9
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
Clothing to meet a school requirement	14
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	13
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	4
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	5

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	447	340
4	399	309
5	385	322
6	321	257
7	306	236
8	264	201
High School	454	255
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	450	316
4	399	297
5	386	291
6	323	238
7	304	226
8	264	177
High School	466	218
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	316
K	148
1	167
2	151
3	125
4	121
5	94
6	115
7	90
8	82
9	86
10	94
11	54
12	42
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,693
Total	3,378

Comments:

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Several areas of TN continued to experience drought in the summer months for a second year in a row. This has affected our farmers' choices of crops and harvesting methods. The continued drought as well as farmers' choices have resulted in a decrease in the number of migrant farm workers needed. For example, one of our largest tomato farms in East TN, has now chosen to harvest only green tomatoes rather than only red. Harvesting of green tomatoes can be done mechanically without additional farm hands and can be accomplished prior to full effects of drought setting in.

Our numbers were also decreased as a result of two separate immigration raids in our poultry processing plants, one in Chattanooga and another in Springfield. These raids resulted in the displacement of many of our migrant families.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	116
K	60
1	72
2	35
3	36
4	28
5	38
6	25
7	31
8	30
9	36
10	31
11	11
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	67
Total	621
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In TN we have tried to focus on increasing the number of services provided to migrant families during the summer. This direct focus has helped our programs design coordinated services to serve more of our migrant population.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TN state count for both Category 1 and Category 2 were generated from MIS2000 as in years past.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

When approved Certificates of Eligibility are received, school age (pK-12) migrants are compared to lists of students from the State's student information database. This information is used to confirm grade and verify school enrollment information and to verify accuracy of Qualifying Arrival Date give. This data is collected throughout the year. The COE is entered into the MIS 2000 Database. In order to prevent duplications, the migrant's name is checked against the existing enrollement and then the birth date is checked in case of spelling differences. Once the information has been entered, lists are printed that include all the enrolled migrants by county and/or district. These lists are sorted alphabetically. Monthly, copies of the lists are forwarded to the district for confirmation of the data. Should there be differneces in grade and/or school information, this is correcterd within the database.

The child count data for the A2 count was collected through service logs submitted by the program areas regarding the services provided to migrant students. These logs were submitted for entry into the MIS 2000 database where the services were coded and recorded. We also collect data on services provided during the regular school year. Enrollments for the regular school year are given a code of R, P or G. Enrollments for summer term or intersession are given a code of S, T or L.

For reporting purposes, MSeD has created several reports that print out information necessary for the CSPR. The information compiled in the report is checked monthly to maintain accuracy(our reports are called an Overview for Count Accuracy and 12 Month Contact Report for a complete list by district). The report looks for migrants between the ages of 3 and 22 years that have enrolled between the start and end date of the program year. The list is then sorted by grade. Our checks and balances include expoeting the information to Excel and manually sorting the information.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data entry specialist enters the COE inforamtion for migrant students into MIS 2000 upon receipt of the COE. When we are informed by school districts or parents of information that needs to be updated such as grade level, enrollment dtaes, address, etc., the chagnes are made in the database. From this information, we are able to use existing reports or create new reports to organize child counts by district, county, or state totals.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following has been copied directly from MIS2000's 12 Month Contact List report:

```
School History.QA3Date >= !StartDate
((Student.TwentySecondBDay >= !StartDate) and
(Student.ThirdBDay <= !EndDate))
((School History.WithdrawDate is between !StartDate and
!EndDate) or (School History.EnrollDate is between
!StartDate and !EndDate))
((School History.Type <> S) and (School History.Type <>
T) and (School History.Type <> L) and (((School History.Type
= P) or (School History.Type = R) or (School History.Type =
G))))
((School History.TermType <> N) or (School
History.TermType is null))
```

The !StartDate is 9/1/2007 and the !EndDate is 8/31/2008.

The School History.TermType <> N indicates that only qualifying migrants are selected. P, G and R, are considered regular year enrollment types and S, T, and L are Summer or Intersession enrollments. The above report specifically selects "P, G or R" enrollment types and omits "S, T and L" enrollment types.

For Summer Intersession the report looks only for those students that have an enrollment type of S, T or L.

In order to ensure unduplicated counts, a Variable is attached to the formatted report that looks for duplicated students (the same StudentSeq) and suppresses their count to one for the final count. The actual report contains two columns, one duplicated and one unduplicated.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following has been copied directly from MIS2000's 12 Month Contact List report:

```
School History.QA3Date >= !StartDate
((Student.TwentySecondBDay >= !StartDate) and
(Student.ThirdBDay <= !EndDate))
((School History.WithdrawDate is between !StartDate and
!EndDate) or (School History.EnrollDate is between
!StartDate and !EndDate))
((School History.Type <> S) and (School History.Type <>
T) and (School History.Type <> L) and (((School History.Type
= P) or (School History.Type = R) or (School History.Type =
G))))
((School History.TermType <> N) or (School
History.TermType is null))
```

The !StartDate is 9/1/2007 and the !EndDate is 8/31/2008.

The School History.TermType <> N indicates that only qualifying migrants are selected. P, G and R, are considered regular year enrollment types and S, T, and L are Summer or Intersession enrollments. The above report specifically selects "P, G or R" enrollment types and omits "S, T and L" enrollment types.

For Summer Intersession the report looks only for those students that have an enrollment type of S, T or L.

In order to ensure unduplicated counts, a Variable is attached to the formatted report that looks for duplicated students (the same StudentSeq) and suppresses their count to one for the final count. The actual report contains two columns, one duplicated and one unduplicated.

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.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

After COEs have been entered into the database, a report is run to ascertain accuracy of spelling and data. Monthly reports are forwarded to LEAs listing all identified migrants in their districts. Errors are reported back to the data entry specialist and corrected. Twice a year an internal audit is completed. During the audit, a report is printed that contains every migrant enrolled in the program for the program year. This report is then compared against the physical COE. This procedure catches duplications, omissions and errors.

During the preparation of the monthly reports, they are exported to Excel and the information is analyzed for priority, duplication, and accuracy of entering. All of the newly enrolled migrants are highlighted allowing further inspection of the entry.

The supervisor of the data entry specialist also has a copy of the database and refers to it frequently, providing another source of audit.

The final steps taken by the staff to verify the child count is an audit of the whole year just prior to the submission to USDOE. This audit is a comparison of each hard copy COE to the information stored in the database.

Finally, during the preparation of the figures for reporting, not only does the database produce the count of students per grade, a complete listing of enrolled migrants is sorted in Excel and compared to the computer-generated count.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Before COE's are approved and sent to the data entry specialist, a re-interview is conducted on 10% of the COE's. This involves re-contacting migrant families by phone or face-to-face and conducting a re-interview. If errors are found, these COE's are not submitted for entry into the database until the errors are corrected. In the event that the family or youth is deemed not eligible, the information is not entered into the database.

All COE's are reviewed for accuracy of complete home addresses and other information before being approved.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Audits are conducted at various times of the year comparing lists of migrant students with the COE's on file. In addition, districts are asked to review the accuracy of the data on their student lists when the monthly reports are distributed to the districts and report any discrepancies to the data entry specialist.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the A1 count a final audit is completed at the end of the year comparing report information generated from MIS 2000 and the actual paper COE's contained in program files.

All service log data with information regarding program services is reviewed by the state coordinator and the data entry specialist before entry into the database for the A2 count. Information is then reviewed again after it has been entered into the database.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We will continue to work to design training for program staff and recruiters that meets their needs to ensure that correct eligibility determinations are made upon recruitment of migrant families.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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