

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 2011-12**

ARKANSAS



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**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) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 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, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Arkansas	
Address: #4 Capitol Mall, Rm 401A Little Rock, AR 72201	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Jim Boardman	
Telephone: 501-371-5005	
Fax: 501-371-5010	
e-mail: Jim.Boardman@arkansas.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jim Boardman	
<div style="text-align: right;">Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 11:54:22 AM</div> <div>Signature</div>	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.
State has revised or changed	

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2012-2013	2012-2013	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have been implemented in grades 3 - 8 for the 2012-2013 school year. The CCSS will be implemented at grades 9-12 in the 2013-2014 school year.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>No Revisions or changes</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

--

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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*.

No Revisions or changes	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

--

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 2011-12, 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)	100.00
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	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 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)	___ No
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)	___ No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	___ No
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	___ No
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	___ No
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	___ No
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	___ No
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	___ No
Other	___ No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	S	286,245	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,961	>=99
Asian	S	4,276	>=99
Black or African American	S	60,077	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	28,915	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,331	98
White	S	185,621	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,979	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	30,332	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	19,333	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	176,034	>=99
Migratory students	S	2,484	>=99
Male	S	145,778	>=99
Female	S	140,383	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	8,082	26.65
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,669	54.96
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,581	18.40
Total	30,332	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The alternate achievement numbers include a portfolio based high school math course. The number of students enrolled in the course fluctuates based on the IEP.		

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	S	249,165	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,721	>=99
Asian	S	3,667	98
Black or African American	S	52,487	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	25,118	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,122	97
White	S	161,478	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,512	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	28,283	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	16,923	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	154,156	>=99
Migratory students	S	2,171	98
Male	S	127,255	>=99
Female	S	121,841	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	
--	--

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	7,857	27.78
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,526	58.43
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,900	13.79
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	28,283	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	S	106,668	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	731	>=99
Asian	S	1,579	>=99
Black or African American	S	22,427	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	10,313	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	462	>=99
White	S	69,713	>=99
Two or more races	S	1,406	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	11,860	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,777	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	64,239	>=99
Migratory students	S	894	>=99
Male	S	54,402	>=99
Female	S	52,225	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	2,196	18.52
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,517	63.38
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,147	18.10
Total	11,860	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	36,266	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	243	S	81
Asian	580	S	94
Black or African American	7,412	S	74
Hispanic or Latino	4,175	S	86
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	187	S	66
White	23,050	S	91
Two or more races	608	S	88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,457	S	61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,210	S	83
Economically disadvantaged students	23,812	S	83
Migratory students	390	S	79
Male	18,774	S	86
Female	17,483	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 9 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,238	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	243	S	79
Asian	572	S	91
Black or African American	7,412	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	4,163	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	182	S	66
White	23,047	S	86
Two or more races	608	S	81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,457	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,182	S	76
Economically disadvantaged students	23,790	S	76
Migratory students	385	S	72
Male	18,762	S	77
Female	17,467	S	87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 9 records had NULL values for gender.			

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No science assessment is administered 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	36,487	S	82
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	S	85
Asian	501	S	90
Black or African American	7,639	S	67
Hispanic or Latino	4,040	S	80
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	195	S	51
White	23,304	S	87
Two or more races	575	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,423	S	47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,062	S	76
Economically disadvantaged students	23,715	S	76
Migratory students	377	S	72
Male	18,577	S	80
Female	17,906	S	84
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 4 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,446	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	S	83
Asian	493	S	92
Black or African American	7,638	S	75
Hispanic or Latino	4,016	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	188	S	64
White	23,303	S	89
Two or more races	575	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,423	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,022	S	79
Economically disadvantaged students	23,679	S	80
Migratory students	371	S	77
Male	18,559	S	80
Female	17,883	S	90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 4 records had NULL values for gender.			

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No science assessment at grade 4			

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	36,640	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	S	82
Asian	550	S	88
Black or African American	7,687	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	3,774	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	175	S	49
White	23,639	S	82
Two or more races	549	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,304	S	37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,730	S	67
Economically disadvantaged students	23,438	S	69
Migratory students	340	S	60
Male	18,884	S	74
Female	17,745	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 11 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,614	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	S	89
Asian	544	S	92
Black or African American	7,687	S	75
Hispanic or Latino	3,760	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	171	S	71
White	23,637	S	89
Two or more races	549	S	83
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,303	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,705	S	79
Economically disadvantaged students	23,416	S	81
Migratory students	336	S	74
Male	18,874	S	81
Female	17,729	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 11 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,640	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	S	67
Asian	550	S	74
Black or African American	7,687	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	3,774	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	175	S	27
White	23,639	S	70
Two or more races	549	S	60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,363	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,762	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	23,438	S	50
Migratory students	340	S	46
Male	18,884	S	60
Female	17,745	S	59
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 11 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,385	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	S	73
Asian	560	S	88
Black or African American	7,721	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	3,695	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	177	S	50
White	23,451	S	82
Two or more races	517	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,057	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,469	S	65
Economically disadvantaged students	23,071	S	68
Migratory students	335	S	63
Male	18,580	S	73
Female	17,796	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 9 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,357	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	S	73
Asian	554	S	87
Black or African American	7,721	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	3,680	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	172	S	50
White	23,449	S	82
Two or more races	517	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,057	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,442	S	59
Economically disadvantaged students	23,045	S	67
Migratory students	333	S	61
Male	18,567	S	68
Female	17,781	S	82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 9 records had NULL values for gender.			

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not assessed 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	36,487	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	76
Asian	512	S	89
Black or African American	7,770	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	3,532	S	77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	167	S	57
White	23,786	S	83
Two or more races	439	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,968	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,314	S	71
Economically disadvantaged students	22,586	S	70
Migratory students	320	S	69
Male	18,719	S	75
Female	17,758	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 10 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,454	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	78
Asian	505	S	88
Black or African American	7,770	S	67
Hispanic or Latino	3,508	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	165	S	66
White	23,786	S	85
Two or more races	439	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,968	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,286	S	70
Economically disadvantaged students	22,556	S	74
Migratory students	313	S	71
Male	18,700	S	74
Female	17,744	S	87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 10 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	36,487	S	40
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	47
Asian	512	S	58
Black or African American	7,770	S	13
Hispanic or Latino	3,532	S	33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	167	S	14
White	23,786	S	50
Two or more races	439	S	46
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,017	S	9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,382	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	22,586	S	29
Migratory students	320	S	18
Male	18,719	S	41
Female	17,758	S	40
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 10 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	35,921	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	254	S	68
Asian	527	S	83
Black or African American	7,792	S	43
Hispanic or Latino	3,386	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	142	S	45
White	23,349	S	77
Two or more races	467	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,764	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,050	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	21,653	S	59
Migratory students	273	S	61
Male	18,228	S	69
Female	17,688	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 5 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	35,906	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	254	S	85
Asian	524	S	86
Black or African American	7,792	S	66
Hispanic or Latino	3,375	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	142	S	58
White	23,348	S	85
Two or more races	467	S	86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,764	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,035	S	68
Economically disadvantaged students	21,639	S	73
Migratory students	270	S	65
Male	18,222	S	73
Female	17,679	S	87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 5 records had NULL values for gender.			

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not assessed at grade 8.			

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	68,059	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	452	S	81
Asian	1,046	S	89
Black or African American	14,056	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	6,313	S	72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	288	S	49
White	45,042	S	85
Two or more races	824	S	81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,359	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,498	S	59
Economically disadvantaged students	37,759	S	70
Migratory students	449	S	62
Male	34,016	S	77
Female	34,007	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 36 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	31,150	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	212	S	70
Asian	475	S	71
Black or African American	6,467	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	2,616	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	S	41
White	20,908	S	77
Two or more races	357	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,311	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,251	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	16,031	S	56
Migratory students	163	S	45
Male	15,571	S	62
Female	15,558	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 21 records had NULL values for gender.			

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	33,541	S	41
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	S	48
Asian	517	S	59
Black or African American	6,970	S	15
Hispanic or Latino	3,007	S	29
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	120	S	10
White	22,288	S	51
Two or more races	418	S	48
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,480	S	6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,633	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	18,215	S	27
Migratory students	234	S	19
Male	16,799	S	42
Female	16,722	S	41
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These 20 records had NULL values for gender.			

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,110		
Districts	289		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We were granted ESEA Flexibility waiver and AYP no longer applies. The School count includes all schools with an Operational Status of Open, New, Added, Changed Agency or Reopened. The District count includes all districts with and Operational Status of Open, New, Added, Changed Boundary or Reopened. This means that the school count includes vocational schools and schools classified under school type '5' reportable programs like Arkansas Correctional Schools and Department of Youth Services. The district count includes COOPs, Career Technical Schools, and Reportable programs (district leas). For the most part we don't collect membership and some are only included in the directory files for specific reporting purposes (i.e. Special Education, Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youths). The count for this section without the inclusion of the above should be Schools -1080 and Districts-258 as represented in file N103 from which this information use to prefill.			

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 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	828		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	737		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	91		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We were granted ESEA Flexibility and AYP no longer applies.			

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
253		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We were granted ESEA Flexibility and AYP no longer applies.		

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	26
Extension of the school year or school day	9
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	5
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	23
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	1
Other major restructuring of the school governance	41
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Other major restructuring of the school governance" actions selected by schools includes the following:

- *Implementation of curriculum modification;
- *Utilizing external providers;
- *Implementation of Learning Communities;
- *Hiring of a School Improvement Specialist;
- *Participation in additional professional development;and
- *Providing remediation classes for students

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.

The School Improvement Unit indicated the following as technical assistance strategies provided to the districts:

- *Provided information and direction on best practices as noted in Scientific Based Research
- *Provided professional development on how to analyze and effectively use data to build school capacity and improve student performance
- *Provided opportunities for leadership training to district leadership teams
- *Provided opportunities for leadership training to school leadership teams
- *Provided assistance in development and implementation of a school leadership that focused on the targeted subpopulation (s) missing AMO
- *Provided assistance in development and implementation of a district leadership that focused on targeted subpopulation(s) missing AMO
- *Assisted in the development of a district level school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014
- *Assisted in the development of a school level school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014

This year we also provided guidance to school regarding Flexibility with a greater degree to Focus and Priority Schools. We also provided weekly visits to Priority Schools to assist with School Improvement and monthly visits to Focus Schools assist with School Improvement

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	25
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	2
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	5
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	2
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	2
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were 436 schools and 145 districts that submitted corrections to change their ESEA status (previously called appeals to AYP designations). There were 41 schools and 5 districts who had changes in final status during the appeal submission and processing time for the 2011-12 school year. Processing for ESEA Status changes was completed on November 19, 2012.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 3.50%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The amount distributed to schools was \$5,324,734.18 which was 3.5415 percent of the total \$156,379,574. Statewide System of Support (SSOS) is for a school improvement initiative. The SSOS amount was \$292,749.79 which was 0.1872%. The total amount was 3.7287 with the two of these. The remainder .2713 percent (\$424.179.90) was used to restore - hold harmless back to the level of funding.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

SIG Site Directors were placed in four cohort 2 schools. These positions offer continual, on-site technical assistance to schools.

SEA provided technical assistance in developing an application for funds, implementing the grant as approved, and evaluating the LEA's effectiveness of carrying out the grant with fidelity. Guidance was provided in the review of external providers, budget development, carrying out the strategic plan, developing capacity, planning professional development, and recruiting and retaining highly qualified personnel.

The SEA performed quarterly monitoring visits to all SIG schools. A monitoring protocol based on the goals and objectives developed by each school was used by the SEA monitoring team. This monitoring team was lead by the SIG Program Administrator and also included at least one other SEA SIG Program personnel. The monitoring team met with school principals and the leadership team established by the LEA. Data and documents pertaining to progress in meeting school goals and indicators were reviewed and discussed. The monitoring team visited classes, interviewed faculty and students, and met with the superintendent of schools if needed. Financial audit trail reports were collected at each visit. LEA's were given written reports that identified strength/success and concerns. The following areas were monitored to ensure progress:

- *Implementation of all elements of the selected intervention model
- *Effectiveness of instruction in meeting the student achievement goals
- *Feedback from students, teachers, parents, and school leadership to determine if the school and staff are invested in the success of every student.
- *Progress toward working with external provider, if applicable
- *Progress toward the following leading indicators:

1. Number of minutes within the school Year
2. Students participation rate on State Assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics by subgroup
3. Dropout rate
4. Student attendance rate
5. Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college/high school, or dual enrollment classes.
6. Discipline incidents
7. Truants
8. Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system
9. Teacher attendance rate

Upon completion of monitoring visits, technical assistance was provided based on needs.

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 2011-12 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.

The School Improvement Unit indicated the following as technical assistance strategies provided to the districts:

- *Provided information and direction on best practices as noted in Scientific Based Research
- *Provided professional development on how to analyze and effectively use data to build school capacity and improve student performance
- *Provided opportunities for leadership training to district leadership teams
- *Provided opportunities for leadership training to school leadership teams
- *Provided assistance in development and implementation of a school leadership that focused on the targeted subpopulation (s) missing AMO
- *Provided assistance in development and implementation of a district leadership that focused on targeted subpopulation(s) missing AMO
- *Assisted in the development of a district level school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014
- *Assisted in the development of a school level school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014

This year we also provided guidance to school regarding Flexibility with a greater degree to Focus and Priority Schools. We also provided weekly visits to Priority Schools to assist with School Improvement and monthly visits to Focus Schools assist with School Improvement.

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	135,462
Applied to transfer	230
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	230
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 456,148

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	142

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	86,278
Applied for supplemental educational services	4,039
Received supplemental educational services	4,039
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 6,747,556
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	181,889	180,522	99.25	791	0.43
All elementary classes	115,096	114,305	99.31	791	0.69
All secondary classes	66,793	66,217	99.14	576	0.86

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

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

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State uses a departmentalized approach, where a classroom is counted multiple times; once for each subject taught

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.

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	80.40
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	19.60
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	74.30
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	25.70
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

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	25,333	25,101	99.08
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	32,668	32,503	99.49
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,176	13,037	98.95
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	21,185	21,100	99.60

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	80.80	54.30
Poverty metric used	Percent free/reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	71.20	47.30
Poverty metric used	Percent 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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Dual language	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Structured English immersion	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No	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	32,814
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	29,920
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	28,379
Marshallese	1,672
Vietnamese	462
Hmong	341
Arabic	221

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).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	32,461
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,285
Total	33,746
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,637
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	7.81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	29,328
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,120
Total	30,448
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
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.	4,548

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%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	8,737	35.26	8,505	29.00
Attained proficiency	2,421	8.25	1,173	4.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 (MFLEP) 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
871	923	1,794
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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
1,621	S	96	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,467	S	97	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
578	S	73	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Results	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	41
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	16
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	39
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	35
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	20
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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> </u> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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> </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
0	0	0

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.

LEAs did not meet state formula for eligibility.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational 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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,215
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	872

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 and 1.6.4.)
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	28	////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	19	////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	26	////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	25	////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	9	////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	31	6,806
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	31	1,977
PD provided to principals	27	334
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	22	214
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	27	802
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	1,109
Total	150	11,242

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/12	8/09/12	40
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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.

LEAs may request access to funds as their budgets are approved; TA can be provided LEAs on shortening the length of the budget approval process.
--

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	224	214
LEAs with subgrants	15	15
Total	239	229
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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)	89	81
K	674	269
1	701	271
2	638	260
3	628	230
4	584	239
5	572	215
6	497	192
7	518	166
8	459	177
9	441	165
10	425	120
11	350	81
12	405	92
Ungraded	11	
Total	6,992	2,558
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers do not match because no grantees reported ungraded.		

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	564	258
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,152	2,095
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	84	66
Hotels/Motels	192	139
Total	6,992	2,558
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 Birth Through 2	65
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	81
K	269
1	271
2	260
3	230
4	239
5	215
6	192
7	166
8	177
9	165
10	120
11	81
12	92
Ungraded	0
Total	2,623
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Age Birth through 2 data was not collected in our data for 2011-2012. This date was a manual entry. We had 65 Birth through 2 students served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.	

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	92
Migratory children/youth	50
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	468
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	117
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	861	615
4	823	632
5	771	597
6	717	489
7	685	473
8	658	441
High School	487	254
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	862	669
4	825	582
5	774	515
6	717	469
7	688	449
8	659	333
High School	1,041	708
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science 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		
4		
5	774	368
6		
7	688	184
8		
High School	492	129
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	1,088
K	574
1	602
2	559
3	471
4	532
5	467
6	448
7	419
8	323
9	327
10	332
11	209
12	155
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	982
Total	7,488
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

N/A

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	62
K	98
1	108
2	88
3	70
4	90
5	63
6	37
7	38
8	23
9	13
10	14
11	7
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	75
Total	789
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Factors that have effected summer migrant counts:

We increased our efforts to serve migrant students in the home where no school site program is available.

We provided a new summer program for Out of School Youth.

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 state of Arkansas MEP used MIS 2000 system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts. 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.

The Migrant Child counts are based first on eligibility data and individual student data from the COE, which is collected and entered throughout the year. These data are collected by means of face to face interviews with the migrant families by trained MEP recruiters. The pertinent eligibility data and further documentation are noted on the Arkansas COE and the Supplementary Documentation Form either hardcopy or by electronic COE. The Arkansas COE contains all the pertinent data and was first designed in 2009 and approved by OME and has recently been submitted for approval of a revision. The data are entered, reviewed, and verified in the migrant education database in a multi-stage review process by our Recruitment Eligibility Data Specialists (REDS). Educational and other service data are also used in the calculation of child counts. These data are collected on student records, data entry forms and lists and are entered in the SIS throughout the year as services are provided.

All students who are physically enrolled in the district who were migrant students the previous year and continue to be eligible will receive a new school history line for the current year. Any preschooler or Out of School Youth who was a migrant in the previous year must have their residency verified for the present year before they can be counted in the system. This is verified by a visit to the home, a call to the family or an interview with the youth or family member. Once their residency is verified they may have a new school history line placed on the database and will be counted in the query.

The Summer/Intercession count requires further data to be collected and recorded from migrant intercession staff demonstrating a Summer Enrollment and receipt of a migrant funded instructional service during the Summer Enrollment period.

The following eligibility, student and educational data items are collected in compliance with national COE and Arkansas Migrant Education Program requirements:

Names of Migrant Children

Parent or Guardian Names

Complete Address

Sex

Birth date

Birthplace

Multiple Birth

Birth Verification

Grade

Ethnicity

Moved from city, state, country

Moved to school district and state

Qualifying Arrival Date

Residency Date

Qualifying Worker Name

Qualifying Activity

If work was Obtained or Sought

Temporary or Seasonal

With whom the move was made

Interview Date

Interviewer Name

Interviewee Name

General Comments

Further Documentation

Enroll Date

Termination Date

Graduation Date

GED

Enrollment Type

Supplemental Program Start Dates

Supplemental Program Service Data

Withdraw Date

Generation Date

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data are input on electronic COEs in the field or at regional databases and uploaded to the state database daily or when any COE or intercession data is entered. When new eligibility data is entered and reviewed a date of birth and name search is run to ensure that a new student ID should be created.

The uploading process involves Internet contact to the state database and is usually done first thing in the morning or last thing in the day, but can be done anytime data is added or revised. Any time the loading process is done through the Internet all updated or new data is also downloaded to the regional databases from the state ensuring that all databases have the identical information each time Internet contact is made. The data uploaded can be verified by reconnecting with the state database through the Internet. All entered and uploaded data is processed and stored on tables and can be accessed by searches and queries. As the information is processed Student Records are made available to the Migrant Clerks through a web based data system or can be printed the migrant staff to be checked for errors and filed after any necessary corrections are made and processed.

Three times a year, usually in August, November and April, complete lists of the students are sent to the projects to be checked for accuracy and completeness. Projects are also encouraged to check the database through the Internet for individual students and complete lists of all of the migrant children in their district. During the year any time that parents are contacted the data may be reviewed for accuracy and changes may be made if errors are found or revisions are needed. Lists and special reports are provided any time during the year upon request. When updates are made a record is made available electronically to the school/district for verification of accuracy.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Summer/Intercession data is collected and maintained the same.

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 child counts are retrieved from the state database through queries that count only distinct student numbers statewide. The Category I queries calculate all eligible children who were residing in the state between the dates of 09/01/2011 and 08/31/2012. The query counts only students that have a school history or residency line with activity during the 09/01/11 to 08/31/12 timeframe to ensure that the students were in the state during the reporting period. The queries are set up to only count the children who have completed three years of age before 08/31/2012 and have not left the state before their third birthday and children who turn twenty-two years of age after 09/01/2011. The queries are also designed to eliminate, from the count, children whose three-year eligibility have run out before 09/01/2011 or have a termination date before 09/01/2011. The Summer/Intercession queries count all children who show a Summer Enrollment, have a MEP funded Supplemental Instructional Code attached to that enrollment and are eligible for funding purposes anytime during the Summer Enrollment 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.

The Summer/Intercession queries count all children who meet the requirements described for Category I; who show a Summer Enrollment, have a MEP funded Supplemental Instructional Code attached to that enrollment and are eligible for funding purposes anytime during the Summer Enrollment period; between 05/25/12 and 08/01/12.

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.

Quality Control begins with staff development. All recruiting staff goes through a thorough training regimen with state and regional level workshops. The Recruitment/Eligibility/Data Specialist (REDS), who are charged with review/verification of all eligibility decisions, recruiter training, and data review; receive training once a year from the SEA and have periodic meetings with the SEA on any changes that may occur during the year. The REDS also attend the OME conferences and other national conferences for further staff development. The recruitment staff also works with veteran recruiters before they complete their training. These trained recruiters interview the potential migrant parent, guardian, out-of-school youth or other person to determine eligibility. If the children are determined to be qualifying Migrant Students or Out-of-School Youth, a COE will be filled out with the necessary information and a supplementary documentation form if needed. This can be done electronically or on hard copy. The hard copies and electronic COE data are sent to the REDS for entry and initial review. Upon entry or receipt of the COEs the REDS will then review the COE data. When all information is correct and eligibility reviewed, they will approve the child(ren) on the COE. Upon approving the children/COE it will be routed to the verifier. COEs awaiting verification will show a status of "Reviewed". The REDS doing the verification has to determine that everything is correct and that the eligibility documentation is clear and adequate. They then enter their name in the Verifier Name field on the Signatures panel. Once the name has been entered, then the verifier can click the "Approve COE" button to send the COE back to the initial REDS reviewer. The reviewer will know which COEs are awaiting their final review because those COEs will have a status of "Verified". At this point, the reviewer only has to sign the COE. The COE is now a fully approved COE in the database.

When a COE is rejected during the review process for any reason it will be returned back one step to the person that previously owned it and will have log comments for any questions, errors, corrections and reasons for rejections. A COE can be rejected multiple times if needed. All Draft COEs and logs can be viewed by all REDS and the SEA at any time during the process.

Eligibility is also reviewed during the on-site monitoring reviews of LEAs. The SEA monitors about half of the program LEAs each year and approximately 10% of COEs are reviewed for accuracy and eligibility determinations as the LEAs are monitored. COEs are randomly drawn, reviewed and discussed with the LEA personnel to review student eligibility during the reviews. Before summer programs begin each student who is projected to receive summer school services must be verified as currently migrant and eligible for services or are eligible for services under continuation of services provisions. Current and accurate summer school enrollment forms that list each student's name, ID number, attendance dates, hours of instruction, and subject are required and maintained daily for each summer program. These forms are reviewed as the summer programs are visited and during regular monitoring reviews. All eligibility questions that arise are dealt with by a standard procedure. The procedure is included in the ARMEP Handbook and is incorporated in the training that each recruiter is given. The following is a simple outline of the eligibility question process used in training: 1. The recruiter faced with difficulty determining eligibility gathers all relevant information and forwards it to the REDS. 2. The REDS reviews information and may request additional information from the LEA. The REDS may consult the State MEP staff, if the situation warrants, for eligibility determinations. 3. SEA will determine what guidance was given if a similar case has been reviewed in the past. If no precedent case is on file, eligibility will be decided based on the facts of the individual case. The SEA will then contact the REDS with a decision. 4. REDS will share the eligibility decision with LEA or Regional Recruiter. 5. The Recruiter will thoroughly explain the eligibility decision using the direction from the REDS or SEA on the COE and Supplementary Documentation Form.

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.

We use several procedures for re-interviews. Our REDS do several informal telephone re-interviews before COE data is entered or approved; we do some re-interviews when we have a new recruiter; some re-interviews are done when we feel there is a need in an area and we do random re-interviews which are conducted by an independent interviewer.

The ADE has developed and implemented a random re-interview process in accordance of the provisions in 34 CFR 200.89 (d). The ADE uses a rolling sample report developed with the MIS2000 technical staff. The universe of the random sample consists all of COEs on the ADE migrant database that have been validated as eligible for the MEP in the specified timeframe. The COEs are queried by a unique COE ID in a list ordered by log validation date. Every fifteenth COE is

selected and the first child on the selected COE is to be validated by a re-interview. The frequency of the COEs selected for re-interviews is determined by a calculation of the number of COEs validated in the previous year for the same timeframe, taking into account the number of students that need to be re-interviewed. To ensure a higher response rate the first and second replacement COEs are the following two COEs on the same random list. If the first COE/student cannot be re-interviewed after three attempts, the next COE on the list will be attempted. If that student cannot be validated by a re-interview after three attempts it will pass to the next COE on the list. If in turn after three attempts no interview can be done on the third COE it is considered a non-response.

The lists are run approximately every two months throughout the year and are sent to the re-interviewer. The re-interviewer is provided with a copy of the selected COEs with the additional COE supplementary forms. The re-interviewer works with regional and local staff to ensure they have the most current information on the residence and location of the selected COE. The re-interviewer then follows the re-interview procedures as described in the written protocol and uses the same reporting format for documentation and reporting to complete the re-interviews. The re-interview is different from the initial contact/interview and must not be conducted at the same time as the original interview.

All re-interviewers receive uniform training on the re-interview procedures and are required to use the same procedures and reporting format. The re-interview is different from the initial contact/interview and must not be conducted at the same time as the original interview. During the interview all data regarding eligibility and student information is verified. All discrepancies are documented for review and correction and a decision is made on the validity of the original eligibility determination. In the interview all data regarding eligibility and student information is verified. All discrepancies are documented for review and correction and a decision is made on the validity of the original eligibility determination.

During the re-interview process some discrepancies were found in the following: 3 birth dates, 2 qualifying arrival dates, 2 residency dates, 2 address information, 5 spelling of names, 2 missing names, and an 1 incorrect district ID

The students found ineligible were from; 1.a move that did not qualify, 2. non-qualifying work, and 3. a move not made, (the worker was driving to the job).

The following is a summary of the Arkansas Migrant Education Random Re-Interviews:

77 - Students on Random Sample List

60 - Actual interviews

17 - Non-response

57 - Students Found Eligible

3 - Students found Ineligible

78% Response Rate

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.

Before entering data from a COE on any child a name and birthdate based search is run on the state database to verify for previous information. If the child is already on the database the REDS input/approve the new data with the existing Student Identification Number. If the child is not found on the database a distinct Student Identification Number is created by the SIS and the data is input with the new number.

All enrollments, updates and records entered in the SIS during the year can be printed by the school or staff who requested the data input for verification of accuracy through the web based data system. During the year there are opportunities to validate the data on the databases by means of lists of eligible students currently enrolled, printing of the Migrant Student Records, lists of residency only and preschool children by access to the web version of the database or from the REDS, and reports written for specific needs as per school district or regional request. During the year lists of possible duplicate students are run to consider if the students are duplicated on the database. If, after review by the regional data specialists and the SEA, it is determined that the children have duplicate numbers the identifiers are merged. Also the MSIX Data Administrator receives a work list of possible duplicate students from MSIX. The Administrator reviews the possible duplicate students and makes a decision about merging.

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.

A complete list of all eligible Migrant Children for each region and district is made from the state database. These lists and counts are run with the Category I queries first. The same queries are run on the regional database and compared with results on the state database. If there are discrepancies they are researched by student number. REDS send a copy of the list report to the Migrant Clerk in their respective region to verify that the list compares correctly with the students in their schools. Any discrepancies are also reviewed individually. Running the queries for Summer/Intercession on the state

database and breaking it by district is done after the Category I verification. The REDS for each region are given the counts and relay those district counts to the LEA Migrant Clerks. If there is any disagreement in the numbers the Migrant Clerks send a list of the Migrant Children that were served in the summer to the REDS and they check that each student has the proper information in order to appear on the Summer/Intercession count.

After all counts have been verified the Recruitment Eligibility Data Coordinator along with the state director reviews and compares all data items to the data provided for the prior year's CSPR. If there are any dramatic changes they are investigated to ensure that they are correct and to find out what factors may have caused the changes if the data is correct. The Recruitment Eligibility Data Specialists and the state director finalize all data before it is entered in the EDEN. If any comments are required the state director will provide them and must verify and approve the data before it is considered finished and sent to the CSPR Coordinator for final verification.

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.

Corrective actions: Ineligible students have been removed from the database and any services provided to those students have been discontinued. We have spent more time in the recruitment and eligibility training on the importance of requesting documents such as a birth certificate or other documents that will have the correct dates and spelling of names and current address and we will continue to do so. We have also reviewed the process of carefully going over the information on the COE with the interviewee before finalizing and requesting a signature. We will particularly address verifying and understanding qualifying moves and qualifying activities in documenting eligibility in our future training. Individualized training is provided for recruiters who need review on areas of eligibility. The SEA will continue to adjust the state and regional trainings for any topics that have caused students to be considered ineligible and any areas that are seen in our COE verification process that repeatedly cause COEs to be rejected.

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.

N/A