

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT
PROGRAMS under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
ACT As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2010-11**

ALASKA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 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 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p style="text-align: center;">Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2010-11 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2010-11	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Alaska Department of Education & Early Development	
Address: PO Box 110500 Juneau, AK 99811-0500	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Margaret MacKinnon	
Telephone: 907-465-2970	
Fax: 907-465-2989	
e-mail: margaret.mackinnon@alaska.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Margaret MacKinnon	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"><div>_____ Signature</div><div>Monday, April 16, 2012, 9:41:21 PM Date</div></div>	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Over the last ten months Alaska has engaged in the process of revising academic content standards for mathematics and language arts. Various stakeholders, including K-12 teachers, Postsecondary representatives, content specialists, Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) staff and individuals representing the business community have met several times to develop the new Alaska academic content standards. DEED staff will present the draft standards for mathematics and language arts to the State Board of Education and Early Development on December 15, 2011. With the Board's approval the new standards will be available to the public through an extended public comment period. The Board will also review DEED's transition plan for implementation of the new standards. Alaska hopes to adopt the new standards in June 2012. The new standards will then be introduced in fall 2012 to Alaska's public schools.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Alaska plans to implement new assessments based on revised academic achievement standards in the 2015-2016 school year in mathematics and language arts. Alaska does not currently plan to revise the assessments or the achievement standards for science.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	74.9
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	25.1
Comments:	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

1.2 Participation in State Assessments

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	77,254		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	17,456		>97
Asian	4,806		>97
Black or African American	2,868		>97
Hispanic or Latino	4,745		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,588		>97
White	40,217		>97
Two or more races	5,574		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,759		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,279		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	34,052		>97
Migratory students	5,218		>97
Male	39,751		>97
Female	37,503		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,093	20.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,730	73.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	649	6.2
Total	10,472	
Comments: Alaska does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	77,254		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	17,456		>97
Asian	4,806		>97
Black or African American	2,868		>97
Hispanic or Latino	4,745		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,588		>97
White	40,217		>97
Two or more races	5,574		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,759		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,279	7,989	96.5
Economically disadvantaged students	34,052		>97
Migratory students	5,218		>97
Male	39,751		>97
Female	37,503		>97
Comments:			

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

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

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

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,143	20.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,662	73.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	648	6.2
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	10,453	
Comments: Alaska does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	28,642	27,096	94.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	6,298	5,916	93.9
Asian	1,858		>97
Black or African American	1,071	1,012	94.5
Hispanic or Latino	1,679	1,614	96.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	601		
White	15,166	14,300	94.3
Two or more races	1,969	1,873	95.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,726	3,510	94.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,103	2,938	94.7
Economically disadvantaged students	12,201	11,526	94.5
Migratory students	1,904	1,808	95.0
Male	14,758	13,963	94.6
Female	13,884	13,133	94.6
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	831	23.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,450	69.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	229	6.5
Total	3,510	
Comments: Alaska does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,561	7,127	74.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,156	1,212	56.2
Asian	550	409	74.4
Black or African American	373	227	60.9
Hispanic or Latino	599	429	71.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	201	117	58.2
White	4,853	4,105	84.6
Two or more races	829	628	75.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,441	742	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,264	493	39.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,540	2,949	65.0
Migratory students	560	376	67.1
Male	4,894	3,614	73.8
Female	4,667	3,513	75.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,556	7,772	81.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,175	1,352	62.2
Asian	544	458	84.2
Black or African American	372	297	79.8
Hispanic or Latino	594	493	83.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	197	150	76.1
White	4,848	4,338	89.5
Two or more races	826	684	82.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,430	755	52.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,260	591	46.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,537	3,352	73.9
Migratory students	563	415	73.7
Male	4,880	3,819	78.3
Female	4,676	3,953	84.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Alaska does not test students in science at grade 3.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,743	7,327	75.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,247	1,241	55.2
Asian	617	492	79.7
Black or African American	354	234	66.1
Hispanic or Latino	588	441	75.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	215	132	61.4
White	4,931	4,168	84.5
Two or more races	791	619	78.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,474	665	45.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,272	512	40.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,614	3,062	66.4
Migratory students	645	415	64.3
Male	5,052	3,769	74.6
Female	4,691	3,558	75.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,722	7,215	74.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,246	1,117	49.7
Asian	606	420	69.3
Black or African American	354	230	65.0
Hispanic or Latino	583	438	75.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	212	106	50.0
White	4,932	4,282	86.8
Two or more races	789	622	78.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,469	566	38.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,250	332	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4,592	2,903	63.2
Migratory students	643	387	60.2
Male	5,037	3,574	71.0
Female	4,685	3,641	77.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,573	4,746	49.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,223	528	23.8
Asian	614	206	33.6
Black or African American	347	102	29.4
Hispanic or Latino	582	268	46.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	212	47	22.2
White	4,813	3,204	66.6
Two or more races	782	391	50.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,451	427	29.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,246	99	7.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,551	1,592	35.0
Migratory students	639	195	30.5
Male	4,966	2,549	51.3
Female	4,607	2,197	47.7
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,784	6,869	70.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,233	1,123	50.3
Asian	596	456	76.5
Black or African American	387	227	58.7
Hispanic or Latino	635	416	65.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	188	99	52.7
White	4,943	3,975	80.4
Two or more races	802	573	71.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,516	571	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,052	298	28.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,515	2,724	60.3
Migratory students	656	384	58.5
Male	5,048	3,470	68.7
Female	4,736	3,399	71.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,780	7,640	78.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,243	1,241	55.3
Asian	588	460	78.2
Black or African American	386	290	75.1
Hispanic or Latino	630	509	80.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	185	113	61.1
White	4,945	4,385	88.7
Two or more races	803	642	80.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,515	659	43.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,042	310	29.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,503	3,101	68.9
Migratory students	660	429	65.0
Male	5,038	3,741	74.3
Female	4,742	3,899	82.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Alaska does not test students in science at grade 5.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,694	6,760	69.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,183	1,107	50.7
Asian	603	437	72.5
Black or African American	362	223	61.6
Hispanic or Latino	646	453	70.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	216	114	52.8
White	4,986	3,945	79.1
Two or more races	698	481	68.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,445	493	34.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	887	213	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,418	2,595	58.7
Migratory students	687	426	62.0
Male	5,047	3,424	67.8
Female	4,647	3,336	71.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,709	7,269	74.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,185	1,105	50.6
Asian	597	427	71.5
Black or African American	364	236	64.8
Hispanic or Latino	643	481	74.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	211	118	55.9
White	5,005	4,351	86.9
Two or more races	704	551	78.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,442	523	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	873	152	17.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,407	2,790	63.3
Migratory students	689	422	61.2
Male	5,047	3,563	70.6
Female	4,662	3,706	79.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Alaska does not test students in science at grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,374	6,424	68.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,145	1,084	50.5
Asian	578	423	73.2
Black or African American	340	180	52.9
Hispanic or Latino	580	375	64.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	192	91	47.4
White	4,915	3,840	78.1
Two or more races	624	431	69.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,310	359	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	905	236	26.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,180	2,372	56.7
Migratory students	668	381	57.0
Male	4,761	3,156	66.3
Female	4,613	3,268	70.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,389	7,293	77.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,153	1,192	55.4
Asian	572	452	79.0
Black or African American	341	248	72.7
Hispanic or Latino	576	447	77.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	194	108	55.7
White	4,929	4,342	88.1
Two or more races	624	504	80.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,315	510	38.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	896	223	24.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,188	2,786	66.5
Migratory students	669	414	61.9
Male	4,768	3,529	74.0
Female	4,621	3,764	81.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Alaska does not test students in science at grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,327	6,308	67.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,003	957	47.8
Asian	622	463	74.4
Black or African American	362	179	49.4
Hispanic or Latino	542	333	61.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	193	95	49.2
White	4,980	3,884	78.0
Two or more races	625	397	63.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,171	326	27.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	885	229	25.9
Economically disadvantaged students	3,915	2,152	55.0
Migratory students	644	363	56.4
Male	4,800	3,217	67.0
Female	4,527	3,091	68.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,341	7,761	83.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,007	1,304	65.0
Asian	622	534	85.9
Black or African American	360	268	74.4
Hispanic or Latino	543	437	80.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	191	122	63.9
White	4,996	4,584	91.8
Two or more races	622	512	82.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,169	546	46.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	874	362	41.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,909	2,871	73.4
Migratory students	646	462	71.5
Male	4,800	3,830	79.8
Female	4,541	3,931	86.6
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,083	5,133	56.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,934	578	29.9
Asian	627	331	52.8
Black or African American	359	142	39.6
Hispanic or Latino	536	266	49.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	187	57	30.5
White	4,826	3,427	71.0
Two or more races	614	332	54.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,136	262	23.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	864	54	6.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,821	1,494	39.1
Migratory students	637	239	37.5
Male	4,675	2,714	58.1
Female	4,408	2,419	54.9
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	18,140	11,098	61.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,979	1,704	42.8
Asian	1,175	771	65.6
Black or African American	643	256	39.8
Hispanic or Latino	1,082	582	53.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	353	120	34.0
White	9,822	7,003	71.3
Two or more races	1,086	662	61.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,115	425	20.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,776	356	20.0
Economically disadvantaged students	7,064	3,322	47.0
Migratory students	1,231	626	50.9
Male	9,326	5,630	60.4
Female	8,814	5,468	62.0
Comments: Alaska tests students in grades 9 and 10 for high school.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	18,187	14,149	77.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,994	2,343	58.7
Asian	1,174	871	74.2
Black or African American	644	419	65.1
Hispanic or Latino	1,074	802	74.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	353	173	49.0
White	9,856	8,663	87.9
Two or more races	1,092	878	80.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,113	775	36.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,794	477	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	7,085	4,593	64.8
Migratory students	1,226	793	64.7
Male	9,326	6,872	73.7
Female	8,861	7,277	82.1
Comments: Alaska tests students in grades 9 and 10 for high school.			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	8,440	5,455	64.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,759	753	42.8
Asian	574	345	60.1
Black or African American	306	128	41.8
Hispanic or Latino	496	272	54.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	167	52	31.1
White	4,661	3,574	76.7
Two or more races	477	331	69.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	923	265	28.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	828	116	14.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,154	1,491	47.3
Migratory students	532	262	49.2
Male	4,322	2,875	66.5
Female	4,118	2,580	62.7
Comments: Science is tested at grade 10 only in high school.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	503	230	45.7
Districts	54	12	22.2

Comments: The number of schools making AYP declined from the prior year due to increases in AMO and graduation rate targets.

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 SY 2010-11. 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 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	291	127	43.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	146	45	30.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	145	82	56.6

Comments: The number of Title I schools making AYP declined from the prior year due to increases in AMO and graduation rate targets.

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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
51	10	19.6

Comments:

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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (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))
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	3
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	12
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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.

Alaska requires districts identified for improvement and corrective action to submit district improvement plans for review and approval by the department. Those plans are reviewed and technical assistance is provided to districts. Recommendations are provided for improvement in the plans. Technical assistance audio conferences are held to discuss requirements of district improvement plans and strategies for improvement. Presentations on using data to drive instructional decisions and on using formative assessments aligned to state standards have been by audio conference and at major state conferences.

When a district reaches the level of corrective action, the department performs a desk audit of available data, including district student achievement and AYP data. The department also conducts school-level desk audits of all schools in the state to identify the lowest performing schools that need additional analysis and support. Many of these identified schools are Title I schools, but some are not.

Based on the desk-audit review of district data, the school-level desk audits, and conversations with district superintendents, districts are identified that will receive an on-site visit by an Instructional Audit Team in selected schools in the district to identify the schools' strengths and challenges. A team of Alaskan educators visits schools in corrective action or restructuring to examine documents, observe classroom instruction and interview teachers, administrators and students. Their work is guided by the Instructional Audit Tool, developed by the Alaska Comprehensive Center in collaboration with the department, which focuses on six domains relevant to school improvement planning: curriculum, instruction, assessment, school learning environment, professional development and leadership. The department takes corrective action in a district that is most likely to positively impact student achievement. The corrective action plans typically require districts to implement these key elements: universal screening for all students at least 3 times per year for placement in interventions and progress monitoring (RTI); frequent teacher collaboration meetings to discuss student progress monitoring data, formative assessments, and other pertinent data to improve instruction and implement appropriate interventions; and instructional leader classroom walkthroughs for teacher feedback to improve instructional quality.

The department provides additional support and training to districts in improvement and corrective action. In addition to the Title I Administrator and the School Improvement Program Manager, additional staff positions in the State System of Support (SSOS) provide support to all Title I districts in improvement or corrective action with both Title I and non-Title I schools. The SSOS team includes an administrator, a program specialist, a program associate, and content support specialists in reading, math, and science. Support is provided to districts in a 3-tiered model. Districts in improvement and corrective action (Tiers II and III) receive more directed technical assistance than that available to all districts in Tier I. The department has trained Technical Assistance Coaches and each district receives the assistance of a coach. The department has also provided directed technical assistance and workshops in using formative assessments and progress monitoring tools (such as AimsWeb), effective school leadership, teacher collaboration, and curriculum alignment and mapping. The department has also developed a cadre of Content Coaches, distinguished Alaskan educators, to work with teachers and site instructional leaders in specific content areas for strategies, methods, and classroom management. The majority of their work is with Tier III districts in concert with the technical assistance coaches.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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 2010-11
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	1
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	
Comments: Note that there was only one new district identified for corrective action in 2010-2011. The remaining 20 continued in corrective action and had corrective action implemented in prior years.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 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: Not applicable. No appeals made.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	
---	--

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Alaska used state-level funds from the SIG 1003(g) grant to support the creation of the second round of SIG application documents, the review of the applications, and the general technical assistance to districts in understanding the application requirements and submitting applications for funding. The technical assistance was provided through a series of audio conferences, slide presentations, and individual conference calls with eligible districts. Alaska also used state-level funds to support additional data collection and analysis to determine the lists of eligible schools and for evaluation of the schools implementing SIG 1003(g) grants.

A portion of the state-level funding was used to expand the capacity of the State System of Support (SSOS) to provide on-site support and assistance to the LEAs and schools in greatest need in the state. The SSOS services are targeted to six domains for instructional effectiveness: curriculum (aligned with the Alaska grade level expectations or GLEs); assessment (formative and summative assessments are used regularly to inform instruction); instruction (effective strategies are used to meet the needs of diverse learners); supportive learning environment (a positive school climate provides a safe, orderly environment conducive to learning); professional development (based on data, the needs of the students and schools, and aligned with academic goals); and leadership (school leadership focused on instruction and improving student achievement).

The SSOS Administrator and the Title I/NCLB Administrator collaborate on supporting the implementation of the SIG grants in the Tier I and Tier II schools, assisting the districts in determining the most appropriate support needed for each school. The SIG state funds also support direct work in the SIG schools by Technical Assistance Coaches (TACs) who provide specialized support to these districts in one or more domains in their area of expertise and Content Coaches (CCs) with expertise in the areas of reading, math, and science. These contractors provide on-site support and training for teachers in their areas of expertise.

The SIG state-level funds were used to support state and regional meetings of SIG school staff for specific professional development opportunities related to one or more areas of the SIG implementation. Representatives from each district with a SIG school, principals, and teacher representatives from each school gathered for state meetings in March and June and for a regional meeting in May. Alaska was able to take advantage of the expertise of Laura Goe from the Teacher Quality Center to provide a webinar on the teacher evaluation process in March. Her presentation was very well received and Laura was able to return to facilitate a 2 day workshop on the teacher and principal evaluation process in June. She focused particularly on the area of using student growth data as part of the evaluation process as this area was needed by all schools implementing the transformation model. The June workshop was attended by all 7 SIG schools from cohort 1 and the three new schools from cohort 2.

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 2010-11 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.

In 2010-2011, the State of Alaska funded six staff positions supported by state general funds to coordinate and implement its State System of Support (SSOS). SSOS staff includes an administrator, a school support program manager, a school support education associate, and three content program managers (reading, math, and science). While the SSOS provides the most intensive support to the lowest performing schools and districts, both Title I and non-Title I, the vast majority of schools and districts supported by the SSOS are Title I schools and districts in improvement or above. SSOS supports districts in building their own capacity to sustain student growth. Examining district and school data, it coordinates and provides resources to districts and schools appropriate to their students' achievement levels. SSOS brings training, written and online materials, and technical assistance in three broad areas: assessment, leadership, and collaboration. Resources include leveraging general funds (with ESEA funding) to support webinars, workshops, institutes, noted elsewhere, such as the Curriculum Alignment Institute and the Alaska School Leadership Institute. Within cultural/community settings, resources address supports for student academics (reading, math, science, the arts) and behavior (Positive Behavior Supports). Additional human resources supported in part by state general funds include technical assistance coaches, content coaches, coaches for new administrators, and mentors for new teachers.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	21,879
Applied to transfer	237
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	236
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 55,212

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	17

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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	15,894
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,052
Received supplemental educational services	2,558
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,323,499
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	23,578	21,189	89.9	2,389	10.1
All elementary classes	5,141	4,905	95.4	236	4.6
All secondary classes	18,437	16,284	88.3	2,153	11.7

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state counts a full-day self contained elementary class as one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	87.3
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	6.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	6.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	88.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	1,304	1,226	94.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,290	1,226	95.0
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	1,733	1,329	76.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	8,853	8,170	92.3

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	62.7	27.5
Poverty metric used	Free & Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	85.6	32.2
Poverty metric used	Free & Reduced Lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language Instruction Educational Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language%20Instruction%20Educational%20Programs.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	16,313
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	14,753
Comments:	

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
Yupik languages	6,371
Spanish; Castilian	1,889
Inupiaq	1,525
Filipino; Pilipino	1,301
Hmong	1,201

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	14,879
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,434
Total	16,313
Comments: 91.21% of all LEP students took the ELP assessment in the state. The state continues to work with districts to improve the data and correct identification of LEP students so that students moving between districts will be correctly identified and assessed on the ELP assessment.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,850
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	12.4
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	13,506
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,247
Total	14,753
Comments: The percent of Title III students tested on the ELP assessment was 91.55%.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	2,114

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	3,889	34.1	4,562	40.00
Attained proficiency	1,680	12.4	2,168	16.00
Comments:				

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 <input type="checkbox"/>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No <input type="checkbox"/>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Not applicable.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Not applicable.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Not applicable.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,382	1,512	2,894
Comments:		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,182	1,655	75.8	527
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
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
2,194	1,813	82.6	381

Comments:

1.6.3.6.4 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 out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
798	329	41.2	469

Comments:

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	13
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	6
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	5
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	7
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	13
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	13
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	13

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Not applicable. Alaska has no Title III consortia.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,432	233	1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	96
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	31

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	13	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	13	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	10	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	7	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	10	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	13	1,384
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	638
PD provided to principals	11	138
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	12	70
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	10	400
PD provided to community based organization personnel	4	20
Total	13	2,650

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/10	08/01/10	30
Comments:		

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.

Funds are available for reimbursement to subgrantees effective July 1, 2010, immediately upon approval of the consolidated application. The state continually works with LEAs to revise and reach an approved state for the consolidated application that includes Title III funds. The state has provided an on-site technical assistance workshop in April to assist LEAs in submitting an application before the end of May to improve the opportunity for approvals as soon after July 1 as possible. With many district staff unavailable for questions during the month of July, we strive for approvals in early August.

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:	

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 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	67.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	55.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	60.3
Hispanic	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	74.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	40.0
Limited English proficient	46.9
Economically disadvantaged	58.8
Migratory students	75.6
Male	64.2
Female	71.4
Comments: For 2009-2010, the Asian or Pacific Islander Graduation Rate is 70%.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4.7
Hispanic	4.2
White, non-Hispanic	3.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6.3
Limited English proficient	9.0
Economically disadvantaged	6.6
Migratory students	3.6
Male	5.3
Female	4.6
Comments:	

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 automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	50	50
LEAs with subgrants	4	4
Total	54	54
Comments:		

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	n<	98
K	38	288
1	51	273
2	36	261
3	35	262
4	32	249
5	36	246
6	37	256
7	35	250
8	44	252
9	40	252
10	50	278
11	87	380
12	75	493
Ungraded	n<	0
Total	613	3,838
Comments:		

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	207	832
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	315	2,233
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	53	501
Hotels/Motels	38	272
Total	613	3,838
Comments:		

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)	102
K	283
1	266
2	255
3	251
4	244
5	243
6	252
7	248
8	247
9	241
10	265
11	336
12	490
Ungraded	
Total	3,723
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	938
Migratory children/youth	342
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	937
Limited English proficient students	433
Comments:	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	253	176
4	235	129
5	245	148
6	245	132
7	237	144
8	235	147
High School	452	252
Comments:		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	255	145
4	235	136
5	247	131
6	247	118
7	235	116
8	242	113
High School	447	151
Comments:		

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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)	899
K	844
1	674
2	703
3	741
4	809
5	790
6	778
7	789
8	750
9	828
10	716
11	663
12	634
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	172
Total	10,790

Comments: The State of Alaska MEP does not have any ungraded migrant eligible students. A zero should be reflected in the ungraded box.

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.

--

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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)	143
K	87
1	112
2	97
3	100
4	126
5	99
6	111
7	72
8	78
9	69
10	71
11	52
12	25
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	59
Total	1,301

Comments: The State of Alaska MEP does not have any eligible Migrant ungraded students. The ungraded box should show a zero to reflect this.

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.

--

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.

The Alaska Migrant Education Program used MIS2000 as our migrant student information system to compile and generate our 2010-2011 child count for both Categories 1 and 2. Our child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system.

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.

Data collected and maintained in MIS2000 includes student demographic and move information provided on the COE.

The same information is collected for regular and summer terms. The type of information collected on the COE:

1. Student Name - legal (last name 1, last name 2, first, middle)
2. Alaska Student ID number
3. Birth Data -sex, data of birth, age, multiple birth, ethnicity, place of birth
4. Current School Information -school name, enrollment date and grade
5. Parents' names- mother's and father's names (last and first)
6. Current address - the family's physical address
7. Mailing address - if different from the family's physical address
8. Eligibility Data -residency date; qualifying arrival date; move (to-from) information; name of qualifying worker; check boxes for "with," "to join,"(for to join moves, the date the qualifying worker moved is recorded and must be within 12 months of the child's QAD) or "on own"; check boxes to indicate whether the qualifying worker was the parent, guardian, or spouse; check boxes to indicate if the qualifying worker moved to obtain qualifying work, moved to obtain any work and obtained qualifying work, or moved to obtain qualifying work specifically, but did not obtain the work; check boxes for seasonal or temporary work; check boxes to indicate if the work was agriculture or fishing; a check box to indicate if the qualifying work was for personal subsistence; description of work -type of catch/crop/logging camp and type of gear/activity. Qualifying work activity information is found in our Alaska Harvest Manual: Reference Manual for Records Managers and Recruiters. This publication is updated yearly.
9. Comments -This is the area where additional information or details regarding the family are recorded. This includes: the reason for a "to join" move; the worker or employer's statement for a temporary move, prior history and/or credible evidence if the qualifying worker did not obtain qualifying work, the qualifying worker's address and contact information if different from the children's, as well as a statement verifying the family's economic necessity for the activity.
10. Additional Moves- This area is used to collect additional migrant work activity moves made in a one-year time period.

Additional information comes from regular term Mass Withdrawal forms and Summer School Mass Enrollment and Withdrawal forms, and includes enroll/withdraw dates, grades, termination codes and supplemental programs information. School districts assist the state with recruitment efforts. They hire recruiters to conduct the interviews with the families and complete the necessary forms.

Using a pre-printed or blank COE form, recruiters interview parents and ask relevant questions in order to accurately complete the information required on the COE (effective interview techniques are presented in the Alaska Harvest Manual and at Fall Training). Migrant move and student information is written on the COE form throughout the interview. As the interview comes to an end, the recruiter reviews the completed COE form for accuracy using checklists in the training materials. If any information is unclear, the recruiter will ask additional clarifying questions. The parent reviews the COE for accuracy and signs the COE to verify that the information is correct.

Recruiters work in conjunction with school secretaries or home-school liaison staff in order to identify new families that move into their communities and to interview them for possible migrant activities.

The majority of recruitment for eligible migrant students is done in the fall because most qualifying work activities take place during the summer. The fishing seasons are determined by nature and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and vary depending on the species being harvested. Because of the remote, isolated fish camp locations and large distances between villages (where schools are located) and fish camp sites, it is not possible to have recruitment staff available at the fish camp sites. The recruitment therefore takes place immediately after the summer fishing season from mid-August to November. During that period, all new migrant moves are documented and all currently eligible migrant student families are

interviewed to determine whether a new move was made.

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.

When COEs are completed and signed by the recruiter and the parent, the COE is sent to the district office where the district records manager will review the COE for errors or ambiguity and ascertain whether the family actually meets the migrant eligibility criteria. Once the records manager feels confident that the COE is error free and that the family meets migrant eligibility, and after the district SEA Designated Reviewer reviews and signs the COE, the records manager enters the COE into the student information system, MIS2000. Each district has one workstation with MIS2000 and one records manager trained in the database; this controls data input into the system. When COEs are entered onto the district's MIS2000 workstation and uploaded, then the COE data is electronically transferred to the State of Alaska's main server.

The full MIS2000 database is housed on the State of Alaska Department of Administration's main server. This database contains all records inputted by districts into MIS2000. When a district finishes an electronic upload, eligibility specialists at the Alaska Migrant Education Office will review the submitted COEs. In situations where COEs need additional or updated information, an e-mail will be sent to the district. Districts will then have the opportunity to resubmit the updated COEs through the same electronic process. When COEs are first entered, they are marked with a "Ready for Review" status. After the COE has been reviewed it will then be placed in one of three categories: Incomplete, Cancelled, or Active. Incomplete means that the COE seems to meet eligibility requirements but additional information is needed. Cancelled means that the COE does not meet eligibility requirements and the family has been made ineligible. Active means that the COE is complete and the family meets eligibility requirements. When a COE is marked as Active, all children on the COE are marked as eligible. The eligibility specialists routinely run reports from the MIS2000 database to determine the status of COEs.

Once COE data has been inputted and updated by district staff and has met eligibility requirements, the data is ready to be organized into the CSPR Part 1 report. To do this, an identification and recruitment specialist runs a report in MIS2000's "Report Builder" menu that pulls an extract of all students with a school history line between 9/1/10 and 8/31/11. This extract pulls students based on their Student Sequence number, a unique number assigned by MIS2000 that cannot be manipulated by users. Selecting the data by Student Sequence number ensures that each individual record is pulled and eliminates the possibility of duplication. Once the extract has been successfully imported into Microsoft Access, various queries are performed to ensure that the data is accurate, complete, and absent of any duplication. These queries are used to pinpoint incorrect data entry along with data integrity errors. From these queries, identification and recruitment specialists are able to work with eligibility specialists and district staff to fix the remaining errors. Once all reports have been run and the accuracy of the information has been examined and verified, the count is certified and submitted.

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.

--

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alaska Migrant Education Program develops a series of queries for the MIS2000 database that provide the data necessary to ensure an accurate child count.

Regular Term (category 1) -

Residency 09/01/10-08/31/11

- Must be 3 years old
- Must be less than 20 years old, except for students with disabilities

(Alaska statute 14.03.070 defines school age as less than 20 years old, except for students with disabilities who must be less than 22 years old to be entitled to a free public education.)

-Unduplicated -run alpha by state (student name, Student ID, birth date, parents' names, QAD, residency date, enrollment date)

-QAD within last three years -

Check for termination codes

-Verify with districts on 12th graders not

graduated Summer Term (category 2)

-Make sure regular and summer enrollments do not overlap

- Must be 3 years old
- Must be less than 20 years old, except for students with disabilities

-Unduplicated -run alpha by state (name, ID, birth date, parents' names)

-QAD within last three years.

-Enrolled in MEP funded summer school

-Be sure these students are also included in category 1 count.

The child count data is compiled by running several reports in MIS2000 and queries in Microsoft Access. First, a report is run in MIS2000 which provides an alphabetical listing of eligible children, ages 3-20 who, within three years of making a qualifying move, resided in Alaska for one or more days during the period from September 1, 2010 -August 31, 2011. There are separate reports for the regular school term and summer term. Additional "find duplicate" queries are run on this eligible student list in Microsoft Access to examine such issues as duplicate student ID numbers, names, multiple births, date of birth and terminations. When duplication occurs, the student records are researched in MIS2000 by examining the COE and student data. If additional clarification is needed, MEO staff contact the district or family directly to resolve whether the data reflects two separate students or is duplicate information for the same student. All duplicates are identified and removed (or merged, if appropriate) in MIS2000, so they do not appear in the final eligible student list or eligible student count reports.

For both regular and summer terms, the MEO staff run queries to make sure the child count contains students who fit the following criteria:

1. Residency 09/01/10 -08/31/11
2. Must be 3 years old
3. Must be less than 20 years old, except for students with disabilities
4. QAD within the last three years
5. COEs status active and eligible

The State of Alaska Migrant Education Program develops a series of queries for the MIS2000 database that provide the data necessary to ensure an accurate child count.

The MEO staff ensures that the children in the state database who turn three during the funding period are still residing in the state. As part of the state's identification and recruitment process, children are tracked by the state database from the

first time they make qualifying moves with their families. Since all children with eligibility are contacted yearly and their information is verified, it is not necessary to send specific information to the recruiters.

For the summer term, the students must be enrolled in a Migrant Education Program funded summer school. These summer school students are included in the regular term count. Students who attend summer school only must be reflected in the category 1 count. The queries are run to ensure that the regular and summer enrollments do not overlap.

The eligible student list and child count information from MIS2000 is edited and filtered through several additional queries. Regarding 12th grade students, MEO checks for graduation termination codes. If no code is present, MEO verifies with districts that the students have not graduated. Queries are run to check for twins and triplets and the information is crosschecked with the student record in MIS2000. As mentioned above, several queries are run to locate and resolve duplicate information.

The following is an example of how duplications are handled. John Smith, born 8/1/90 would be noted if another John Smith, born 5/1/98 was on the list. Or, two Mary Smiths each having Robert Smith as a parent would be highlighted. Even students with the same last name and same parents that have been born within an unusually small time period (such as within 10 days of each other) are highlighted.

MEO staff run additional queries to find students or COEs that are flagged as ineligible, inactive or not determined. MEO staff review each record with these pending or inactive markers in MIS2000 to verify that the status is accurate. The final eligible student list is edited so it does not include students who are flagged as pending, inactive or ineligible. MEO staff double check the final eligible student list against the final count report to verify that the number of students on each report is identical.

The unduplicated count is run by name, Student ID, birth date and parents' names. For the summer/intersession count, students are not enrolled into the system as having attended summer school unless a supplemental program is also being reported. A report is generated to verify the names of any students enrolled in summer school who did not have a supplemental programs code reported. Districts are also required to maintain documentation of services provided on-site. These are reviewed as part of the program reviews conducted by the Department of Education & Early Development. None of Alaska's districts operated intersession projects during the 2010-2011 count period.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Alaska Migrant Education Program provides ongoing training and a multi-layered COE quality review process to ensure that migrant student eligibility is properly determined and verified each year. Records managers and recruiters are trained annually in the identification and recruitment process. In the fall, training sessions are held for administrators, records managers and recruiters in six regional centers throughout the state. The three-day training sessions include an in-depth review of eligibility guidelines and extensive practice sessions using ID&R tools (i.e. Alaska Harvest Manual, Recruiter Guide) to determine eligibility and properly complete COEs. All training materials are updated annually and distributed to all district staff who are responsible for migrant education identification and recruitment. Training continues during the fall recruitment season on an individual basis. District records managers work one-on-one with new recruiters. ID&R specialists work with district staff on additional training needs and plans designed specifically for individual districts. Every COE is reviewed for compliance with eligibility guidelines at least three times before it is entered in MIS2000. The recruiter first reviews the COE with the parent when conducting the family interview and obtaining signatures. The records manager conducts a quality review of the COE verifying all the information and signatures. If the records manager finds an error or needs more clarification, s/he instructs the recruiter to re-contact the family. The SEA Designated Reviewer conducts a third review of the COE and s/he verifies that the COE meets eligibility guidelines by signing the COE form. Once all signatures are received, the district records manager enters the COE data into MIS2000 and s/he verifies that the electronic and paper COEs match verbatim.

In addition to these quality control procedures, MEO staff meets regularly throughout the year to assess program needs and develop new quality improvement ideas. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet weekly to discuss any districts that are having difficulty completing COEs or making proper eligibility determinations. The group collectively decides on internal actions or new procedures that can be developed to resolve the problem most efficiently. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet on a weekly basis with the migrant education program manager to discuss specific COE eligibility (as noted above) and any new information pertaining to national laws and guidance. Under the program manager's guidance, the MEO team reviews the long-term training needs and quality improvement efforts that can be implemented during the following school year.

MEO staff also provide ongoing training and communication with districts to improve the quality of our program. For example, ID&R specialists send routine emails to records managers to address common questions and issues that arise during the COE quality review process. This is beneficial to districts with a new or inexperienced staff that may have questions once they begin the recruiting after fall training. Districts can also request an audio conference with their recruiters or MEO staff to discuss problems they are having with the ID&R process.

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.

The State of Alaska ID&R specialists visit approximately 10 districts per year as a part of the technical assistance program. During these on-site technical assistance visits, ID&R specialists conduct a thorough review of the district's identification and recruitment procedures, migrant student files and compliance with eligibility guidelines. Using a Random Student Sample Report generated from MIS2000, the ID&R specialist contacts families in sequential order from the list. The ID&R specialist re-interviews the family regarding migrant activity using the Migrant Eligibility Interview Protocol form for the interview. The information from the interview is then compared to the current COE for accuracy. Every effort is made to contact families that have been recruited by each recruiter in the district. The completed Migrant Eligibility Interview Protocol form is kept on file at the MEO.

Re-interviewing in 2010-2011 was conducted by the state ID&R specialists who are well-trained in eligibility requirements and have full access to all training materials and federal guidance. Before the re-interviewing begins, the re-interviewers meet and review the re-interviewing process and procedure. All recruitment interviews in Alaska are made by trained recruiters at the LEA level. The SEA re-interviews are conducted independently from the original LEA interviewer.

The SEA target for completed re-interview contacts was 50. The size of the random sample for SY10-11 was 106. 46

interviews were completed, and all migrant students were determined to be eligible. The non-response rate was 56%. The process for replacing non-responses is to draw an initial sample at least twice as large as the target for successful contacts and to conduct interviews in order until the target number of contacts is reached. If necessary, an additional random sample would be drawn to continue making contacts if there were more non-responses than were expected.

The SEA is currently in the process of securing a contractor to conduct our independent prospective re-interviewing for the current SY 2011-2012. The re-interviews will be completed no later than April 30, 2012.

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.

The Migrant Education Office (MEO) follows several quality control procedures throughout the school year to maintain the accuracy and integrity of migrant student data in MIS2000. These procedures center on COE quality reviews, verification reports and random sample COE reviews during technical assistance visits. In order to ensure the integrity of migrant student records and COEs in MIS2000, all data collected from previous years is locked.

In the fall recruitment season, the second phase of the COE review process takes place at the state. Upon receipt of the uploaded COE data in MIS2000, the eligibility specialists quality check every COE (New and No New Move). The eligibility specialists carefully review the COE data to ensure that the migrant activity, migrant move, intent of the move and economic necessity for the migrant activity are clearly in alignment with eligibility guidelines. They also review the family and student data for accuracy and correct chronological order. Based on this preliminary state review, the electronic COE is flagged as active, incomplete or canceled.

Eligibility specialists then prepare a COE status report for the district records managers to indicate whether COEs are approved, need more information or are denied. The report lists the COE ID number, student names, birth date, State ID number and a space for comments. If approved, a notation of "Approved" is listed in comments. If the COE is incomplete, the eligibility specialist notes the details or questions that need to be answered in order to make an eligibility determination. If the COE is denied, this is noted on the report. These COE status reports are kept at the MEO to track the adjustments made to COEs. In MIS2000, the COE and student records remain in "incomplete" and "not determined" status while the district is obtaining the additional information. MEO staff run frequent reports of all students in "not determined status" to capture these pending cases and ensure that they are resolved prior to the child count deadline. Once the district obtains and uploads the additional information, the eligibility specialists conduct a final review and make a final eligibility determination.

If the eligibility specialists question data on a COE, they pass the COE on to the ID&R specialists for a secondary review. If more clarification is needed, the ID&R specialists will contact the records manager at the district to ask more detailed questions or instruct the recruiter to ask for more specific clarification from the family. Upon receipt of updated COE information in MIS2000 the eligibility specialists make a final eligibility determination and update the COE status in MIS2000 accordingly.

In cases where the COE data is still not clear, or when the eligibility determination is difficult to make, the MEO staff conducts a third in-house quality check of the COE. Under the guidance of the migrant education program manager, the MEO staff meets to discuss the facts of the case as a group and closely consult the 2010 Non-Regulatory Guidance. The group documents the date, factors discussed and outcome on the COE form and the eligibility specialists or ID&R specialists follow through accordingly.

MEO staff run internal verification reports from MIS2000 to ensure that uploaded COE data is complete and that eligibility determinations are accurate. During the fall recruitment season, eligibility specialists run weekly reports of pending student records that are flagged as "not determined" and COEs that are flagged as "ready for review" or "incomplete." There are separate reports for New and No New Move COEs. The resulting student lists are checked against COE status reports to determine the steps necessary for making the final eligibility determination. ID&R specialists run statewide reports from MIS2000 to review and monitor COE data upload activity by districts and gauge the rate at which the work is completed. The ID&R specialists then use the report data to spot check COEs and assist districts with any COE entry issues. Eligibility specialists continue to run these "pending status" reports throughout the year on a weekly basis. ID&R specialists run additional quarterly reports to check for potential duplicate records, discrepancies in student data (such as ID number or date of birth) or incorrect chronology when students migrate between schools or districts in a school year. Discrepancies are resolved by the ID&R specialists who contact districts and the state assessments office to obtain the correct information in MIS2000.

If a student is reported or discovered to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R specialist at the MEO follows an eligibility termination procedure to research, terminate and report this misidentification. At training, districts are instructed to contact the MEO if they find problems or discrepancies with any COE at any point in the year. The ID&R

specialists investigate any potential eligibility problems that are either reported by districts or are discovered during regular quality checks at the MEO. ID&R specialists document the issue, conduct an investigation, document initial findings and then meet with the Migrant Education Program Manager to discuss the case and make a final determination.

If a student is determined to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R specialist terminates the student and COE in MIS2000 under the code "I" (ineligible) to indicate the student was terminated because they were found ineligible. This changes the record from "active and eligible" to "cancelled and ineligible." The reason for the termination is added to all affected COEs in the database. Reference is made to the additional documentation made by the ID&R specialist. This additional documentation consists of a list of all affected student names, ID numbers and COE ID numbers and a detailed description of the problem, how it was researched, findings by the ID&R specialist, the official date of termination and proof that the termination was completed in MIS2000 (print screens). The ID&R specialist then notifies the district in writing that the student is terminated, the reason for this decision and the effective date of the termination. The district is informed that the MEO has terminated the student in MIS2000 and is instructed to complete the termination by documenting the termination on the original COE in the district file. Districts must write the termination code "I" (ineligible) and reason for the ineligibility finding on each affected COE form.

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.

MEO staff complete several final reviews to verify the accuracy of the child count produced in MIS2000 for this report. MEO staff first review the SQL (Structured Query Language) parameters set for the queries used to produce the counts and other reports on a computerized relational database of the queries used for the counts in category 1 and category 2. As described above, several queries are run on the eligible student list to identify duplicate student data and students with ineligible or inactive status in MIS2000. MEO staff research and resolve these issues and then update the electronic student record accordingly. The final eligible student list reflects this editing and review process and thus only includes students who are verified as eligible and active. Several different MEO staff review the final reports and supporting documentation (queries) to ensure that the final count is accurate.

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.

A process is in place at the MEO to respond quickly and effectively should prospective re-interviewing results question a student's eligibility decision. If a mistake is found on a COE, the ID&R specialist will address these concerns with the district migrant education coordinator and records manager. The concerns will be brought back to the Migrant Program Manager at the MEO and additional research will be done, if necessary. If a student is determined not to be eligible, the ID&R specialist terminates the student and COE in MIS2000 and notifies the district of the ineligibility status in writing. If a pattern is discovered on the part of a specific recruiter or district, the ID&R specialist will create a district plan of action to clarify the problems and the steps the district must take to resolve them promptly. The plan usually requires the district to conduct additional quality review of COEs. The parameters of this quality review are set by the ID&R specialist and indicate the type of and number of files to review. Re-interview may also be required of the district. Following the visit, the ID&R specialist and district staff keep in regular contact to verify that the plan of action is being followed and the problems resolved.

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.

To the best of our knowledge, the eligibility determinations which are the basis for our child count are sound and accurate.