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

VERMONT

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 EDFacts 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-HLPEDEN (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:
__X__Part I, 2007-08 ___Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Vermont Department of Education

Address:
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Kerry Garber

Telephone: 802-828-3150

Fax: 802-828-0573

e-mail: kerry.garber@state.vt.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Kerry Garber

	Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:56:16 PM
Signature	Date

Two sections are incomplete for this submission 1.4.8.1 and 1.10.3.3. These sections will be completed early next week and sent to the program contacts. there are comments in each section that indicate which portions are not yet done.

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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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.

Vermont is currently working under a compliance agreement with USED to revise the alternate assessment of alternate achievment standards. We anticipate that the alternate assessment of alternate achievement standards will be fully revised and in compliance with USED peer review criteria by January 2010.

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.

The New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP)) science assessment is now fully operational and is administered in Vermont at grades 4, 8, and 11. Revisions to the alternate assessment of alternate achievement standards (see above) include science.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	47,136	46,735	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	12	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	99	99	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	120	116	96.7
Hispanic	71	71	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,945	5,927	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,190	6,045	97.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	312	308	98.7
Economically disadvantaged students	14,141	14,002	99.0
Migratory students			
Male	24,164	23,913	99.0
Female	22,972	22,822	99.4

Comments: Due to small n suppression of grade level participation data, the aggregated numbers reported here are incorrect for LEP, Migratory, and Racial Breakouts. The correct data are as follows: Student # Students # Students Percentage Group Enrolled Participating Participating American Indian ..... 126..... 124..... 98.4 Asian or PI..... 763..... 737..... 96.7 Black ..... 770..... 752..... 97.7 Hispanic..... 508..... 505..... 99.4 White.....44,307.....43,968..... 99.2 LEP..... 895..... 885..... 98.9 Migratory..... 192..... 189..... 98.4

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,732	28.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,865	64.0
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	445	7.4
Total	6,042	

Comments: For the purposes of Assessment, Students with an invalid accommodation have been considered as participating and achieving the lowest possible achievement level. For assessments as required under IDEA, these students have been considered non-participants. For the 2007-2008 Math assessments, there were three students with invalid accommodations.

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	47,114	46,762	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,203	6,073	97.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	304	301	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	14,131	14,015	99.2
Migratory students			
Male	24,148	23,920	99.1
Female	22,966	22,842	99.5

Comments: Due to small n suppression of grade level participation data, the aggregated numbers reported here are incorrect for LEP, Migratory, and Racial Breakouts. The correct data are as follows: Student # Students # Students Percentage Group Enrolled Participating Participating American Indian ..... 126..... 125..... 99.2 Asian or PI..... 750..... 724..... 96.5 Black ..... 763..... 751..... 98.4 Hispanic..... 503..... 500..... 99.4 White.....44,311.....44,012..... 99.3 LEP..... 895..... 885..... 98.8 Migratory..... 192..... 189..... 98.4

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,832	30.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,779	62.4
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	448	7.4
Total	6,059	

Comments: For the purposes of Assessment, Students with an invalid accommodation have been considered as participating and achieving the lowest possible achievement level. For assessments as required under IDEA, these students have been considered non-participants. For the 2007-2008 Reading assessments, there were fourteen students with invalid accommodations.

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	20,877	20,381	97.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	71	95.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	327	323	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	301	275	91.4
Hispanic	215	209	97.2
White, non-Hispanic	19,673	19,228	97.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,809	2,632	93.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	322	308	95.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,571	5,387	96.7
Migratory students	26	26	100.0
Male	10,641	10,366	97.4
Female	10,236	10,015	97.8
Comments: The Number of Migratory students in Section 1.3.3 are suppressed by grade because they fall under the small n suppression rules. In aggregate, there are enough to report.			

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,689	64.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	753	28.7
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	183	7.0
Total	2,625	
Comments: For the purposes of Assessment, Students with an invalid accommodation have been considered as participating and achieving the lowest possible achievement level. For assessments as required under IDEA, these students have been considered non-participants. For the 2007-2008 Science assessments, there were seven students with invalid accommodations.		

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	6,333	4,250	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	97	77	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	116	46	39.7
Hispanic	71	35	49.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,928	4,033	68.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	645	170	26.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	188	108	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,129	1,098	51.6
Migratory students	18	N<10	
Male	3,277	2,183	66.6
Female	3,056	2,067	67.6
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	6,319	4,478	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	74	78.7
Black, non-Hispanic	115	60	52.2
Hispanic	70	41	58.6
White, non-Hispanic	5,920	4,230	71.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	643	175	27.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	182	107	58.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,123	1,169	55.1
Migratory students	18	N<10	
Male	3,268	2,161	66.1
Female	3,051	2,317	75.9
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.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science Assessments are only administered at grades 4, 8, and 11.			

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

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,449	3,964	61.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	76	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	91	28	30.8
Hispanic	68	38	55.9
White, non-Hispanic	6,049	3,766	62.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	741	139	18.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	155	85	54.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,134	944	44.2
Migratory students	24	11	45.8
Male	3,275	2,019	61.6
Female	3,174	1,945	61.3
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.

1.3.2.2 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	6,443	4,348	67.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	80	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	91	44	48.4
Hispanic	69	42	60.9
White, non-Hispanic	6,045	4,111	68.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	743	143	19.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	154	96	62.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,134	1,094	51.3
Migratory students	24	11	45.8
Male	3,271	2,047	62.6
Female	3,172	2,301	72.5
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	6,461	3,139	48.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	110	62	56.4
Black, non-Hispanic	92	22	23.9
Hispanic	71	29	40.8
White, non-Hispanic	6,054	2,980	49.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	870	194	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	135	45	33.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,215	710	32.1
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	3,279	1,535	46.8
Female	3,182	1,604	50.4
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,490	4,083	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	17	5	29.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	79	69.9
Black, non-Hispanic	112	39	34.8
Hispanic	71	39	54.9
White, non-Hispanic	6,091	3,875	63.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	905	176	19.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	158	84	53.2
Economically disadvantaged students	2,070	913	44.1
Migratory students	32	15	46.9
Male	3,336	2,078	62.3
Female	3,154	2,005	63.6
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	6,493	4,324	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	17	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	111	85	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	113	57	50.4
Hispanic	70	43	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	6,096	4,081	66.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	907	169	18.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	157	99	63.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,072	1,008	48.6
Migratory students	32	15	46.9
Male	3,336	2,041	61.2
Female	3,157	2,283	72.3
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.

1.3.3.3 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science Assessments are only administered at grades 4, 8, and 11.			

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

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

1.3.1.4 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	6,528	4,226	64.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	109	87	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	113	46	40.7
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	6,133	4,002	65.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	899	161	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	146	77	52.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,094	971	46.4
Migratory students	24	N<10	
Male	3,364	2,163	64.3
Female	3,164	2,063	65.2
Comments: Zero = Suppressed Value American Indian Hispanic			

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	6,524	4,598	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	11	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	86	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	112	52	46.4
Hispanic	72	48	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	6,132	4,351	71.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	901	166	18.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	146	78	53.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,095	1,130	53.9
Migratory students	25	14	56.0
Male	3,360	2,248	66.9
Female	3,164	2,350	74.3
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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science Assessments are only administered at grades 4, 8, and 11.			

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

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,757	4,015	59.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	96	78	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	125	46	36.8
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	6,355	3,807	59.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	992	128	12.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	144	64	44.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,099	852	40.6
Migratory students	32	12	37.5
Male	3,441	2,048	59.5
Female	3,316	1,967	59.3
Comments: Zero = Suppressed Value American Indian Hispanic			

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	6,764	4,773	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	79	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic	125	67	53.6
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	6,366	4,519	71.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	996	179	18.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	133	77	57.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,105	1,109	52.7
Migratory students	33	16	48.5
Male	3,445	2,278	66.1
Female	3,319	2,495	75.2
Comments: Zero = Suppressed Value American Indian Hispanic			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science Assessments are only administered at grades 4, 8, and 11.			

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

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

1.3.1.6 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	7,061	4,128	58.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	22	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	80	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	88	32	36.4
Hispanic	80	43	53.8
White, non-Hispanic	6,656	3,912	58.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	994	131	13.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	114	57	50.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,000	765	38.3
Migratory students	25	11	44.0
Male	3,610	2,046	56.7
Female	3,451	2,082	60.3
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.

1.3.2.6 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	7,057	4,830	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	22	10	45.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	87	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	86	40	46.5
Hispanic	79	54	68.4
White, non-Hispanic	6,656	4,571	68.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	994	202	20.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	114	64	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1,995	1,028	51.5
Migratory students	25	16	64.0
Male	3,608	2,204	61.1
Female	3,449	2,626	76.1
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	7,017	1,829	26.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	22	2	9.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	109	40	36.7
Black, non-Hispanic	89	N<10	
Hispanic	82	21	25.6
White, non-Hispanic	6,610	1,743	26.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,003	31	3.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	96	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	2,059	238	11.6
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,581	970	27.1
Female	3,436	859	25.0
Comments: Zero = Suppressed Value **Migratory students**			

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

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

1.3.1.7 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	7,131	2,121	29.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	40	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	34	32.7
Black, non-Hispanic	107	10	9.3
Hispanic	61	11	18.0
White, non-Hispanic	6,772	2,051	30.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	871	30	3.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	85	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	1,478	228	15.4
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,619	1,100	30.4
Female	3,512	1,021	29.1
Comments: Zero = Actual Value Migratory students			

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	7,176	4,799	66.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	40	20	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	103	69	67.0
Black, non-Hispanic	109	45	41.3
Hispanic	62	43	69.4
White, non-Hispanic	6,813	4,592	67.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	891	135	15.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	85	31	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	1,493	698	46.8
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,641	2,148	59.0
Female	3,535	2,651	75.0
Comments: Zero = Actual Value Migratory students			

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	6,897	1,736	25.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	33	31.7
Black, non-Hispanic	94	10	10.6
Hispanic	56	10	17.9
White, non-Hispanic	6,558	1,666	25.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	752	23	3.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	77	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	1,366	163	11.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,503	857	24.5
Female	3,394	879	25.9
Comments: Science is assessed at grade 11. **Zero = Suppressed Value Migratory students**			

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

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

1.4 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	309	194	62.8
Districts	238	146	61.3
Comments: Data OK-srm			

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	218	133	61.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	140	77	55.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	78	56	71.8
Comments: Data OK-srm			

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
182	109	59.9
Comments: Data checking shows that there are 182 districts that received Title 1 funds in 2007-2008.-srm		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

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

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	9
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	0
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: No Title I schools were in restructuring-year 2 for SY 2007-2008.	

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.

N/A

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- 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.

Because of the definition of district for accountability purposes as the town or union school district, in the majority of cases, the identified district is the same as the identified school, so we work through the identified school consequences.

For those districts with multiple school buildings, we have two types of identified districts: those that have identified schools and those that do not. In those that have identified schools (14) we focus our work on the schools. We provide technical assistance directly to the schools to help them effectively carry out the specific required actions in place depending on their level of identification. We also work with district leadership to assure they are addressing the needs in schools within the district that are not identified but whose performance contributed to the identification of the district.

These actions require the schools to develop a system of progress monitoring to assure students who are struggling are identifed early and provided appropriate support. The impact of the supports must also be assessed and adjusted as needed. Principals are required to participate in monthly principal learning community. Schools at restructuring level must participate in a 3 day data retreat to inform the development of their restructuring plan. In addition, the entire faculty in these schools must particpate in monthly professional learning communities that are guided by a trained facilitator and focused on review of student work and instruction.

For districts that do not have identified schools (9), we work with the district leadership to assure that they are working with schools through the development and implemention of school improvement plans to address the content areas and subgroups that caused the district to be identified.

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	5
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	05/08/08

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	17,012	17,220
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	5,385	5,087
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	31.7	29.5
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	6,261	6,050
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	36.8	35.1
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	32	
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	
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	
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	
Comments: Accountability determinations based on fall 2008 assessments are not available as of 3/13/2009.	

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
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	**Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.**	**Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status**	**Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)**	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.**
6 = Combo 1	1, 2, 3, & 5A See Comments	1			D	As a result of progress monitoring classroom teachers more closely monitor student progress, are able to intervene in a more timely manner, and alter intervention if the data does not indicate improvement.
7 = Combo 2	2, 3, & 5A See Comments	10			D	As a result of progress monitoring classroom teachers more closely monitor student progress, are able to intervene in a more timely manner, and alter intervention if the data does not indicate improvement.
8 = Combo 3	2, 5A & 5B See Comments	16			D	As a result of progress monitoring classroom teachers more closely monitor student progress, are able to intervene in a more timely manner, and alter intervention if the data does not indicate improvement.
5	Combination of 2, 5A See Comments	4			D	As a result of progress monitoring classroom teachers more closely monitor student progress, are able to intervene in a more timely manner, and alter intervention if the data does not indicate improvement.

Comments: 5A:Develop a Progress Monitoring System a) use multiple measures to track student progress. Staff reviews the data from these measures frequently. b) As a result of the analysis of the data, actions will be taken to address the issues presented: provide specific academic supports needed for all students who perform below expectations on those measures being tracked. ? Refer students to the appropriate services and supports. ? Monitor student participation in those supports and their effects on student outcomes. ? Provide evidence of steps taken to address needs identified by the data.

5B:Principal will attend a Principal Learning Community (PLC) made up of other principals in the region on a monthly basis. These PLCs will provide a venue for principals to talk to each other about strategies and challenges related to student achievement, specifically: ? Implementation of the Commissioner's Required Actions Addressing achievement gaps (Free and Reduced Lunch, Students with Disabilities) that caused AYP identification ? Implementation of federal requirements such as Supplemental Educational Services

Accountability determinations based on fall 2008 assessments are not available as of 3/13/2009.

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

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

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83I.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We share effective strategies in a variety of ways:
-large group meetings with all identified schoos,
-school support coordinators direct work with schools
-monthly principal learning communities,
-special training opportunities such as the Formative Assessment Project and the Data -Retreat, Vermont Professional Develpment network (VPDN)
-Resource development (e.g. Item bank for grades 8 and 10)
-online via our department web site
-newsletters

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.

The first year of 1003 (g) funding, we identified 5 Title I identified high schools who agreed to work collaborately with an external contractor and with the DOE to develop an item bank of reading and mathematics items aligned to Grade Level Expectations at Grade 8 and grade 10. The schools wanted measures that they could use to monitor progress of students and use diagnostically to improve student achievement between 8th and 11th grade state assessment. Department staff has provided technical assistance throughout this ongoing effort. Schools are now piloting the use of these items and we are collecting feedback to develop more professional development and technical assistance materials for these schools and others. We will continue to monitor the use of these assessments.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83I.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Our school support coordinators who work with all identified schools are partially supported by state funds. Through our partnership with the Vermont Student Assistance Program (VSAC) in a Gear-Up grant, we are able to provide some funding to non-Title I schools with middle or high grades to implement schoolwide improvement strategies targeted at the reasons they were identified.

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	1,129
Applied to transfer	27
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	27

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	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
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	$ 35,280
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	23
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?
An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.[3]

b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	3,924
Applied for supplemental educational services	116
Received supplemental educational services	110
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	$ 150,546
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	20,185	18,952	93.9	1,233	6.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1,675	1,546	92.3	129	7.7
Low-poverty schools	1,904	1,819	95.5	85	4.5
All elementary schools	6,972	6,536	93.7	436	6.3
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	2,513	2,287	91.0	226	9.0
Low-poverty schools	3,683	3,527	95.8	156	4.2
All secondary schools	13,213	12,417	94.0	796	6.0
Comments: For special education 'classes' one special educator equals one class. 2.7% of total core area classes were excluded from the poverty analysis because poverty data was not available.					

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core*
academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*

c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*

g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	76.1
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	9.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	13.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.7
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other column is special education teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program).

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)	82.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	6.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other column is special education teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program).

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	46.0	22.9
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Meals used for Poverty metric.	
Secondary schools	37.0	19.5
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Meals used for Poverty metric.	
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
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

All 11 LEAs/Consortia also reported using a "Self-Contained ESL Class" (focusing on language instruction)at the high school level and/or an "Inclusionary" language instruction educational program (ESL in the classroom.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data reflect the 2006-2007 school year.

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	1,741
Comments: Vermont conducts fall academic testing and spring English language proficiency testing. In order to align the English language proficiency, academic assessment, and accountability data (results) for the same teaching year, the US Department of Education verbally notified the Vermont SEA in October 2008 that it should report data based on the 2006-2007 school year. 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data were applied to 2008 AMAO determinations which are reported on this 2008 CSPR.	

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.	1,119
Comments: Data reflect the 2006-2007 school year.	

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
Serbo-Croatian	247
Spanish	223
Vietnamese	186
Maay	140
Chinese	112

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000

characters.

French, 100; Turkish 62; Russian 49 Data reflect the 2006-2007 school year.

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	1,680
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	16
Total	1,696
Comments: Vermont conducts fall academic testing and spring English language proficiency testing. In order to align the English language proficiency, academic assessment, and accountability data (results) for the same teaching year, the US Department of Education verbally notified the Vermont SEA in October 2008 that it should report data based on the 2006-2007 school year. 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data are reported here and were applied to 2008 AMAO determinations which are reported on this 2008 CSPR.	

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	470
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	27.7
Comments: 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data are reported here and were applied to 2008 AMAO determinations which are reported on this 2008 CSPR.	

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	1,078
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	11
Total	1,089
Comments: Data reflect the 2006-2007 school year.	

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	669	52.8
ELP attainment	418	33.0
Comments: Data reflect the 2006-2007 school year.		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: Vermont does not have native language academic assessments.

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: Vermont does not have native language academic assessments.

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: Vermont does not have native language academic assessments.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
123	54	177
Comments: Data reflect Monitored Students during the 2006-2007 school year.		

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
141	129	91.5	12
Comments: Data reflect Monitored Students during the 2006-2007 school year, and their assessment results on the Fall 2007 assessment.			

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
141	131	92.9	10
Comments: Data reflect Monitored Students during the 2006-2007 school year, and their assessment results on the Fall 2007 assessment.			

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
0	0	0.0	0
Comments: Science was not assessed in 2006-2007, the academic year in which ELL data are being reported.			

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	11
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	9
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	11
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	10
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	1
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)	1
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	1
Comments: Vermont conducts fall academic testing and spring English language proficiency testing. In order to align the English language proficiency, academic assessment, and accountability data (results) for the same teaching year, the US Department of Education verbally notified the Vermont SEA in October 2008 that it should report data based on the 2006-2007 school year. 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data were applied to 2008 AMAO determinations which are reported on this 2008 CSPR. 8 of 11 Title III subgrantees had less than the minimum "n" size (40) for making AYP determinations under the Title I Accountability Workbook rules. Of the remaining Title III subgrantees, 2 did not make AMAO 3 (AYP for the LEP subgroup). The Title III subgrantee that did not meet AMAOs for 2 consecutive years is the same one that did not meet the AMAOs for 4 consecutive years. It is also the district that is implementing a school improvement plan.	

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 all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: Vermont conducts fall academic testing and spring English language proficiency testing. In order to align the English language proficiency, academic assessment, and accountability data (results) for the same teaching year, the US Department of Education verbally notified the Vermont SEA in October 2008 that it should report data based on the 2006-2007 school year. 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data were applied to 2008 AMAO determinations which are reported on this 2008 CSPR. The state met the target for Making Progress and Attaining Proficiency, but not for Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.	

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 or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or 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
695	270	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.

Data reflects students in 2006-2007.

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.	57
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	35

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	**# Subgrantees**	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	8	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	7	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	7	
Other (Explain in comment box)	11	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	587
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	8	48
PD provided to principals	6	22
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	6	26

PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	33
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	10
Total	11	726

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/07	10/01/07	90

Comments: The Vermont Title III Program's grant period is October 1 -September 30 rather than July 1 -July 30. There are several reasons that we chose to follow this schedule: 1. It allows us to use the results of the English language proficiency (ELP) assessments which arrive during the summer, providing the most up-to-date count of eligible LEP students by district; 2. LEAs have repeatedly said that they prefer submitting the Title III grant in the fall, when staff are back in school again and ready to plan and write the grants; 3. It allows LEAs to plan and implement summer program activities well in advance (which would be difficult to do on the July 1 -June 30 schedule) and provides enough funding to carry them into the first month of school (and tide them over until the next round of Title III funding becomes available).

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 LEAs actually don't go 90 days without access to Title III funds. The majority of districts plan according to the October 1 -September 30 schedule and spread their use of Title III funds out over the year.

The best way to shorten the period of distribution of Title III funds would be:

* Hold Technical Assistance meeting with interested districts in advance to review the criteria for approval of a grant, resulting in less need for revisions and quicker processing in the fall (incomplete grants slow down the approval process.)

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	86.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	85.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	79.0
Hispanic	87.0
White, non-Hispanic	86.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	68.0
Limited English proficient	82.0
Economically disadvantaged	72.0
Migratory students	66.0
Male	84.0
Female	88.0
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 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.

Graduation Rate is the Cohort Graduation rate as defined by the National Governors Association. Graduates/(Initial Cohort + Transfers in - Transfers out). No exemptions.

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	3.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4.0
Hispanic	5.4
White, non-Hispanic	3.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.9
Limited English proficient	3.5
Economically disadvantaged	6.2
Migratory students	16.7
Male	3.7
Female	2.9
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	60	60
LEAs with subgrants	4	4
Total	64	64
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)	0	26
K	66	0
1	59	0
2	63	0
3	52	0
4	61	0
5	43	0
6	40	0
7	44	0
8	32	11
9	29	15
10	26	17
11	24	16
12	40	20
Ungraded	0	105
Total	579	210

Comments: ZERO=SUPPRESSED VALUE "WITHOUT SUBGRANTS": AGE 3 THROUGH 5 NOT K ZERO=ACTUAL VALUE "WITHOUT SUBGRANTS": UNGRADED AGGREGATED TOTAL IN "WITHOUT SUBGRANTS" IS 579 NOT INCLUDING THE SUPPRESSED CELLS ZERO=SUPPRESSED VALUE "WITH SUBGRANTS": GRADES K,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,UNGRADED AGGREGATED TOTAL IN "WITH SUBGRANTS" INCLUDING SUPPRESSED CELLS = 246

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	82	125
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	309	54
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	58	59
Hotels/Motels	138	0
Total	587	238

Comments: TOTAL IN "WITHOUT SUBGRANTS" IS DIFFERENT THAN ABOVE DUE TO SUPPRESSED CELLS. ZERO=SUPPRESSED VALUE "WITH SUBGRANTS": HOTELS/MOTELS AGGREGATED TOTAL IN "WITH SUBGRANTS" IS 238 NOT INCLUDING THE SUPPRESSED CELL.

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)	26
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	11
9	15
10	17
11	16
12	20
Ungraded	105
Total	210
Comments: Zero=Suppressed Value Grades - K,1,2,3,4,5,6,7 Aggregated Total including suppressed cells is 246.	

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	30
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	74
Limited English proficient students	0
Comments: Zero=Suppressed Value -Limited English proficient students Zero=Actual Value -Migratory children/youth	

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	3
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	4
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	3
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	2
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	3
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	4
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other (optional) 1 -Field trips

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	1
School Selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

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	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
High School	0	0
Comments: Zero=Suppressed Value "Taking Assessment" Zero=Suppressed Value "Scored at or above" Grades -3,4,6,7,8, High School Grades -3,4,7,8,High School Zero=Actual Value Zero=Actual Value Grade -5 Grade -5,6		

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	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
High School	0	0
Comments: Zero = Suppressed Value "Taking Assessment" Zero = Suppressed Value "Scored Prof." Grades -3,4,6,7,8,High School Grades -4,7,8,High School Zero = Actual Value Zero = Actual Value Grade -5 Grades -3,5,6		

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-ofschool 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)	32
K	14
1	27
2	24
3	16
4	14
5	23
6	17
7	14
8	14
9	14
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	243
Total	452

Comments: Zero = Suppressed
Value Grade(s) 10, 11, 12 Total = 466
(includes suppressed cell data)

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

The child count number from 06-07 to 07-08 has remained almost the same. After years of significant decreases in the number of eligible migrant students, the numbers seem to have leveled off.

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)	21
K	0
1	18
2	13
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	83
Total	135
Comments: Zero = Actual Value Ungraded Zero = Suppressed Value K, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 Total = 183 (includes suppressed cell data)	

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

As with the Category 1 child count, the Category 2 count is almost the same as in 06-07.

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.

1. Vermont uses MIS2000 to generate both Category 1 and 2 counts.
2. Yes, Vermont has uses MIS2000 for several years.

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.

1. Two sets of data are collected and inputted into the database: information from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and information from the performance reports from locally funded projects (both regular and summer terms).
2. After a family with potentially eligible migrant students is identified,trained recruiters visit the family to determine their eligibility. A COE is completed and sent to the State's Identification & Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator for initial verification. The COEs are then given to the trained Data Specialist who compares the information to any past information on that family (including comparing student State ID number student name and both parents' names) or student. Data such as birth dates and place of birth are doubly checked to ensure that migrant students that have changed names are not counted twice. The final verification is done by the State Director of Migrant Education who signs every COE. The data is then entered into the MIS2000 database. Information on the COEs is updated continually through the year as teachers and recruiters complete "Change" forms. If needed, updated COEs are completed. In addition, local projects and recruiters receive monthly lists of eligible students. They are asked to check those lists for accuracy and then send in any changes to the Data Specialist.
3. The data for this report was collected from 9/1/07 through 11/08 and covers the period 9/1/07 through 8/31/08. COEs are collected as completed throughout the year and performance reports are collected at the end of the regular term and again at the end of the summer term.

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.

All COEs and performance reports come in to one data specialist. The data is first reviewed for accuracy and completeness by both the ID&R Coordinator and by the Data Specialist and then again by the State Director of Migrant Education. The Data Specialist is the only one who inputs the data and in essence controls the database. The database is updated every time a student's situation changes -a move a change in grade leaving the state etc. Monthly reports are created and reviewed for accuracy at both the state and local level. Changes are made if needed.

The Child Count Report was designed according to OME's specifications by Management Services for Education Data in their MIS2000 system. Several test runs are done during the year to ensure that the Child Count information is accurately counting students.

The Migrant Education database is separate but connected to the State's Student Demographic System and to the State's Education Data Warehouse. The State is able to cross-check information on migrant students. This enables us to verify the accuracy of information. The MEP database is still the only one in the State that records students who are in the state for only a short time.

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 same procedure is used. The summer session enrollment for the State's Category 2 count is reported at the end of summer. Projects have up to 30 days after the end of the summer projects to submit in hard copy the summer student participation reports.
When submitted the State Director of Migrant Education approves the reports after clearing up any questions then the Data Specialist enters the information into the database.

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.

1. The Child Count is a report function of our MIS2000 system. It is designed to only count those students that are between 3 and 21 years of age and made a qualifying move within the past 3 years.
2. Students' towns of residency is a data field on the COE. Residency is annually verified by comparing the students in the Migrant Education database (MIS2000) with the State's Student Demographic database (which is updated each October). A report is generated that confirms residency for students that are enrolled in school in Vermont. Another list is generated for students whose residency cannot be verified by the matching process. For those students recruiters go out and verify residency and update the COE. We do not include students in the Count whose residency is not verified. Students are counted only if they resided in the State for at least one day during the period 9/1/07 through 8/30/08.
3. Each funded local project reports the summer/intercession services each student receives in the summer Performance Report. Each year the local projects receive training on the definition of summer/intercession services. From those reports the Data Specialist enters the summer/intercession services each student receives into the MIS2000 database and a summer count report is created. The program only counts those students who receive summer services and are between 3 and 22 and have not yet received their high school diploma. It does not include students on an extended status -those whose LQM was more than 3 years before the start of the summer program.
4. Because only the Data Specialist enters the data she is able to verify that students are only entered once per Child Count category. All students in Vermont are given a non duplicative identification number in both the MIS2000 and Student Demographic databases. Before an identification number is issued to a student a number of checks are performed -are there any similarities between names birthdays parents or other indicating factors. This is done to insure that the same child is not entered twice. MIS2000 is programmed to only count students with separate

This section may not be complete. I will need to check with my staff Monday and if not finished, we will send additional info to the program officer and Alert EDEN.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 2 count is generated using the same system.

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.

Accuracy checks are built into each step of the data process. The first step to guarantee accuracy is appropriate training for both recruiters and the Data Specialist. The State ID&R Coordinator trains all new recruiters and holds monthly meetings to talk about recruitment issues and to review eligibility criteria. All recruiters are trained using the training format suggested by ConQIR and that include materials developed by MERC. They all use a standard COE and checklist to ensure the accuracy of eligibility determinations. The Data Specialist often attends the recruiter meetings. Frequently the State Director of Migrant Education is asked to attend these meetings to clear up questions regarding eligibility. Quarterly, the State Director and the State Coordinator of ID&R meet to evaluate the effectiveness of the recruitment plan and agree on any needed changes. Vermont supports recruiters' attendance at national trainings. Also the State ID&R Coordinator is responsible for annually updating the recruiters' handbook and it includes the latest OME guidance on recruitment and includes the model of training recommended from our participation in the ConQIR consortium. If there is any question regarding eligibility the State Director of Migrant Education makes the final decision. Vermont has supported attendance by both the ID&R Coordinator and recruiters at the National ID&R Conferences.

Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. In some cases schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed a recruiter is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list. Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy.

In October a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME. Several trial runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match.

Finally the State has implemented a reinterview procedure to ensure the quality of our data. 20% of each month's COE's receive a reinterview. The manner is modeled after the procedure Vermont used in the voluntary reinterview process and further refined by procedures implemented during our participation in ConQIR.

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.

There are three primary avenues for which Recruiters find and enroll potentially eligible students; school agricultural employment surveys, farm visits and in-house MEP teacher and recruiter referrals. Each avenue a recruiter uses to locate their eligible migrant students has an element of quality control. For example, of the hundreds of agricultural employment surveys that pass through our ID&R office only a very small percentage turn out eligible students. We carefully screen these candidates and if they appear eligible, only then do we conduct pre-screening phone interview. If after this screening phone call a family still seems migrant eligible we will set up a time for a more formal in-person interview. Many students that appear to be migrant eligible at first glance actually turn out to not qualify upon further investigation. These pre-interview screenings are not included in our Re-Interview data as they never had a COE completed. These families were notified
directly on the spot of the pre-screening that they were not migrant eligible. Because this process occurs prior to completing a COE, students are never enrolled into the system.

As determined by the VT MEP's ID&R Quality Control Plan, a 20% random sample is conducted monthly for all COE's that are completed
by VMEP Recruitment staff. This proactive "Rolling Reinterview" process allows us to conduct reinterviews prior to a student's enrollment into our program. This sample size is determined by tallying all new COEs completed during the corresponding month, calculating 20%, and then pulling one in every five for reinterview. All re-interviews were conducted over the telephone by the state ID&R coordinator, or

when practical in person. In all cases, the reinterview is always conducted by some one other than the initial recruiter. A standard re-interview protocol was utilized for conducting and recording the interviews and is based upon recommended procedures from our participation in ConQIR.

Results from the period 9/1/07 through 8/30/08:
New COEs collected during the period 93
Reinterviews conducted 21 or 22.6%
Total errors 6 or 6.5%
Update reinterviews during the period 85

Our Quality Control Plan is designed to prevent actual enrollment of erroneous COEs and during this period, NONE OF THE STUDENTS WITH ERRONEOUS COEs WERE ENROLLED OR INCLUDED IN THE CHILD COUNT. THUS, I FEEL CONFIDENT THAT ALL STUDENTS COUNTED IN THE CHILD COUNT ARE ELIGIBLE.

The errors found were in 2 areas: 1)different dates of birth given especially by out-of-school youth; and 2)issues arising from the new definition of temporary in the 8/08 regulations. As a result, new recruiter training has been updated to include a higher focus on these issues.

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.

Information is entered as COEs are done and at least weekly. Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. In some cases schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed a recruiter is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list.

Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy.

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.

In October a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed (for both Category 1 & 2 counts) by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME/EDEN. Several runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match.

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.

The SEA has already implemented a rigorous quality control plan. In addition through our participation in the ConQIR consortium we have been able to review our procedures with those of other states and against best practices. The consortium has developed a number of "standardized" forms and procedures which we are already using. By improving our recruiting procedures and by continually reinterviewing we will attain our goal of a 0% error rate.

Our challenge this year is to fully understand the new ID&R regulations and then review our eligibility checklists to ensure that Vermont is in compliance with the new regulations.

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.

We have no concerns at present.

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