

# **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**

**FLORIDA**



**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: Florida Department of Education		
Address: 325 W Gaines St, Suite 644 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Sara Dixon		
Telephone: (850) 245-0657		
Fax: (850) 245-5036		
e-mail: Sara.Dixon@fldoe.org		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Tony Bennett		
<div style="text-align: right;">Friday, March 8, 2013, 1:21:04 PM</div>		
Signature _____		

Verification process complete 3/8/2013

# **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	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.

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content 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

<p>Florida's State Board of Education (SBE) approved the adoption of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics in July, 2010. Full implementation of these Common Core standards will be completed during the 2013-2014 school year.</p> <p>Florida also completed a revision to its Fine Arts (Dance, Music, Theater, and Visual Art) and World Languages content standards which were approved by the SBE for adoption on December 17, 2010. Full implementation of these standards will be completed during the 2014-15 school year.</p> <p>Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards for Health, Physical Education, and Social Studies were also revised and adopted by the SBE in December, 2008.</p> <p>In September, 2009, the State Board of Education approved a new rule requiring a periodic review of content standards for potential revision within a maximum period of 12 years.</p>
---

**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*.

State has revised or changed	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	described below	described below	described below
Regular Assessments in High School	described below	described below	described below
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	No changes	No changes	No changes

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

<p>Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8  Math: 2010-11 (NGSSS); 2014-15 (common core)  Reading: 2010-11 (NGSSS); 2014-15 (common core)  Science: 2011-12 (NGSSS)</p> <p>Regular Assessment in High School  Math: 2010-11 (Algebra 1); 2011-2012 (Geometry); 2014-15 (Common Core)  Reading: 2010-11 (NGSSS); 2014-15 (common core)  Science: 2011-12 (Biology 1)</p> <p>FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics and the Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment, which are aligned to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS), are currently undergoing ED peer review.</p>
---

### 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)	5.00
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	95.00
<b>Comments:</b> 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)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	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	Yes
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
<b>Comments:</b> 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	1,334,268	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	5,371	97
Asian	S	33,086	>=99
Black or African American	S	308,306	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	390,203	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	555,374	98
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	185,830	96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	98,272	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	834,066	97
Migratory students	S	7,651	97
Male	S	686,300	97
Female	S	647,968	98
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.			

### 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	57,267	30.82
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	108,458	58.36
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	20,105	10.82
Total	185,830	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not administer the Alternate Assessment based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards or the Alternate Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	1,577,678	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	6,285	97
Asian	S	41,054	>=99
Black or African American	S	356,615	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	454,842	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	670,175	98
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	207,910	96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	107,268	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	951,179	97
Migratory students	S	8,656	97
Male	S	806,451	97
Female	S	771,227	98
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.			

#### 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	66,468	31.97
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	121,396	58.39
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	20,046	9.64
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	207,910	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not administer the Alternate Assessment based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards or the Alternate Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	385,900	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,600	98
Asian	S	9,908	>=99
Black or African American	S	86,585	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	110,328	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	165,381	98
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	53,684	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	20,642	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	235,034	98
Migratory students	S	1,799	98
Male	S	197,163	98
Female	S	188,737	98
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.			

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	14,246	26.54
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	32,057	59.71
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,381	13.75
Total	53,684	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not administer the Alternate Assessment based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards or the Alternate Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards.		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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



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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	203,802	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	772	S	57
Asian	5,358	S	81
Black or African American	47,510	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	61,600	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	81,383	S	69
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	28,908	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,033	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	133,132	S	48
Migratory students	1,426	S	41
Male	105,837	S	58
Female	97,965	S	58

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 2011-12, Florida transitioned to new standards and achievement levels for the FCAT 2.0 in Reading and Mathematics. Because the new achievement levels were considerably more rigorous than the previous year's achievement levels, the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient decreased, as expected.

Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.

Added during the Verification process:

Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	203,893	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	772	S	53
Asian	5,355	S	76
Black or African American	47,552	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	61,569	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	81,469	S	70
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	28,939	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,931	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	133,181	S	46
Migratory students	1,429	S	31
Male	105,874	S	54

Female	98,019	S	60
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 2011-12, Florida transitioned to new standards and achievement levels for the FCAT 2.0 in Reading and Mathematics. Because the new achievement levels were considerably more rigorous than the previous year's achievement levels, the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient decreased, as expected.</p> <p>Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:</p> <p>Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.</p>			

### 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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess students at this grade level in science.  Added during the Verification process: In 2011-12, Florida was in a transition year to replace the FCAT Science Assessment with the state's Biology I EOC Assessment. In 2011-12, FCAT Science was discontinued at the high school level, and the Biology 1 EOC Assessment was in its baseline year and did not yet have achievement level cut scores set.			

### 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	194,458	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	765	S	61
Asian	5,127	S	82
Black or African American	44,086	S	43
Hispanic or Latino	57,272	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	80,681	S	69
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,924	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,276	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	124,046	S	51
Migratory students	1,253	S	44
Male	99,655	S	61
Female	94,803	S	59
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 2011-12, Florida transitioned to new standards and achievement levels for the FCAT 2.0 in Reading and Mathematics. Because the new achievement levels were considerably more rigorous than the previous year's achievement levels, the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient decreased, as expected.</p> <p>Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process: Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.</p>			

### 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	194,285	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	764	S	58
Asian	5,116	S	78
Black or African American	44,050	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	57,190	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	80,645	S	73
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,899	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,177	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	123,905	S	52
Migratory students	1,254	S	37

Male	99,554	S	59
Female	94,731	S	65
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:</p> <p>Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.</p>			

### 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			
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess students at this grade level in science.</p> <p>In 2011-12, Florida was in a transition year to replace the FCAT Science Assessment with the state's Biology I EOC Assessment. In 2011-12, FCAT Science was discontinued at the high school level, and the Biology 1 EOC Assessment was in its baseline year and did not yet have achievement level cut scores set.</p>			

### 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	200,725	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	803	S	55
Asian	5,267	S	82
Black or African American	45,249	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	58,692	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	84,114	S	67
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	27,807	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,964	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	126,712	S	47
Migratory students	1,179	S	41
Male	102,519	S	58
Female	98,206	S	56
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:            Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.</p>			

### 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	200,606	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	805	S	56
Asian	5,260	S	78
Black or African American	45,222	S	43
Hispanic or Latino	58,638	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	84,083	S	72
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	27,795	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,890	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	126,605	S	51
Migratory students	1,175	S	37
Male	102,419	S	58
Female	98,187	S	65
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:</p>			

Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.



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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	194,576	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	780	S	49
Asian	5,045	S	73
Black or African American	43,939	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	56,231	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	82,136	S	64
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	27,019	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,794	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	122,247	S	41
Migratory students	972	S	30
Male	99,266	S	54
Female	95,310	S	50

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.

Added during the Verification process:

In 2011-12, Florida was in a transition year to replace the FCAT Science Assessment with the state's Biology I EOC Assessment. In 2011-12, FCAT Science was discontinued at the high school level, and the Biology 1 EOC Assessment was in its baseline year and did not yet have achievement level cut scores set.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	199,769	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	794	S	52
Asian	5,123	S	80
Black or African American	45,724	S	34
Hispanic or Latino	57,848	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	83,935	S	64
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,425	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,018	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	124,730	S	42
Migratory students	1,098	S	34
Male	101,980	S	52
Female	97,789	S	54
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:            Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.</p>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	199,419	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	801	S	58
Asian	5,110	S	77
Black or African American	45,652	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	57,741	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	83,792	S	69
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,332	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,927	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	124,433	S	46
Migratory students	1,094	S	30
Male	101,781	S	53
Female	97,638	S	61
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:</p>			

Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess students at this grade level in science.  Added during the Verification process: In 2011-12, Florida was in a transition year to replace the FCAT Science Assessment with the state's Biology I EOC Assessment. In 2011-12, FCAT Science was discontinued at the high school level, and the Biology 1 EOC Assessment was in its baseline year and did not yet have achievement level cut scores set.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	199,041	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	792	S	55
Asian	4,911	S	82
Black or African American	44,993	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	57,460	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	84,910	S	67
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	25,993	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,419	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	121,312	S	45
Migratory students	1,042	S	41
Male	102,186	S	56
Female	96,855	S	57
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process: Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.</p>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	199,008	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	792	S	56
Asian	4,905	S	76
Black or African American	45,008	S	39
Hispanic or Latino	57,428	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	84,901	S	70
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	26,020	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,354	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	121,315	S	47
Migratory students	1,038	S	30
Male	102,125	S	56
Female	96,883	S	60
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:</p>			

Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
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			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess students at this grade level in science.  Added during the Verification process: In 2011-12, Florida was in a transition year to replace the FCAT Science Assessment with the state's Biology I EOC Assessment. In 2011-12, FCAT Science was discontinued at the high school level, and the Biology 1 EOC Assessment was in its baseline year and did not yet have achievement level cut scores set.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	195,338	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	846	S	59
Asian	4,962	S	83
Black or African American	43,368	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	55,952	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	84,445	S	67
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	25,224	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,651	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	115,539	S	47
Migratory students	955	S	41
Male	99,824	S	57
Female	95,514	S	59
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.  Added during the Verification process: Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	195,349	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	845	S	56
Asian	4,962	S	74
Black or African American	43,405	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	55,944	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	84,422	S	66
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	25,266	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,618	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	115,573	S	45
Migratory students	953	S	31
Male	99,845	S	53
Female	95,504	S	59
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.  Added during Verification process:			



Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	188,921	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	815	S	47
Asian	4,823	S	69
Black or African American	41,842	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	53,527	S	42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	82,299	S	60
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	24,262	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,802	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	111,097	S	35
Migratory students	822	S	19
Male	96,396	S	51
Female	92,525	S	44

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.

Added during the Verification process:

In 2011-12, Florida was in a transition year to replace the FCAT Science Assessment with the state's Biology I EOC Assessment. In 2011-12, FCAT Science was discontinued at the high school level, and the Biology 1 EOC Assessment was in its baseline year and did not yet have achievement level cut scores set.

**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	141,135	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	599	S	48
Asian	2,338	S	68
Black or African American	37,376	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	41,379	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	55,906	S	56
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	24,549	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,911	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	88,595	S	41
Migratory students	698	S	34
Male	74,299	S	46
Female	66,836	S	48

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 2011-12, Florida transitioned to new standards and achievement levels for the FCAT 2.0 in Reading and Mathematics. Because the new achievement levels were considerably more rigorous than the previous year's achievement levels, the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient decreased, as expected. In addition Florida transitioned to an End of Course exam for Algebra I and so it is expected for the numbers taking the exam to be less than previous year's assessments.

Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.

Added during the Verification process:

Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.

**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	385,118	S	51
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,506	S	49
Asian	10,346	S	69
Black or African American	85,726	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	106,332	S	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	170,863	S	64
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46,659	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,371	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	206,167	S	39
Migratory students	1,713	S	26
Male	194,853	S	51

Female	190,265	S	52
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process:</p> <p>Florida includes the following racial/ethnic categories for accountability reporting, as indicated in the state's accountability plan: American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, and White. The racial/ethnic categories of "Two or More Races" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander are not major ethnic groups that the state was required to include for AYP and accountability reporting. These students are included in the All Students group and account for the difference between the sum of the totals for the accountability-based groups and the All Students group. Florida's high school math assessments are lower for 2011-12 because the state replaced its comprehensive math assessment in grades 9 and 10 (FCAT) with an end-of-course assessment for Algebra 1.</p>			

### 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	2,403	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	S	N<
Asian	S	S	N<
Black or African American	804	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	570	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	946	S	73
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,403	S	74
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46	S	70
Economically disadvantaged students	1,690	S	76
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	1,501	S	75
Female	902	S	72
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida is transitioning to an End of Course exam for Biology. In 2011-12, Florida did not assign achievement levels in science to high school students; therefore the total number of students are expected to be low.</p> <p>Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include "multi-racial" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" and so these data have been omitted.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process: In 2011-12, Florida was in a transition year to replace the FCAT Science Assessment with the state's Biology I EOC Assessment. In 2011-12, FCAT Science was discontinued at the high school level, and the Biology 1 EOC Assessment was in its baseline year and did not yet have achievement level cut scores set.</p>			

## 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	4,465		
Districts	76		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida was granted permission to no longer report AYP in Florida's ESEA Waiver.			

### 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	1,759		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,751		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	8		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida was granted permission to no longer report AYP in Florida's ESEA Waiver. The total number of SWP and TAS shown is accurate. The Total of all Title I schools shown as 1763 is not accurate and should reflect 1759.			

### 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
73		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida was granted permission to no longer report AYP in Florida's ESEA Waiver.		

#### 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	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through the Differentiated Accountability plan and subsequent waiver awarded to the Florida Department of Education (amendment approved April 8, 2010), Florida is incorporating nearly all the options available to schools under corrective action or restructuring.	

#### 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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through the Differentiated Accountability plan and subsequent waiver awarded to the Florida Department of Education (amendment approved April 8, 2010), Florida is incorporating nearly all the options available to schools under corrective action or restructuring.	

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.

Through the Differentiated Accountability plan and subsequent waiver awarded to the Florida Department of Education (amendment approved April 8, 2010), Florida is incorporating nearly all the options available to schools under corrective action or restructuring.

**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 Department provided direct technical assistance through the Differentiated accountability office and Regional teams to ensure a statewide system of support. While direct support was provided to individual low-performing schools in the state, the regional support teams also partnered with LEAs to build local capacity allowing districts to develop the skills and processes needed to conduct their own site visits and follow-up reviews. This capacity building provided LEAs with the tools necessary to further support all schools and ensure a continuum of growth.



**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).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through the Differentiated Accountability plan and subsequent waiver awarded to the Florida Department of Education (amendment approved April 8, 2010), Florida is incorporating nearly all the options available to schools under corrective action or restructuring.	

**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.

<b>Entity</b>	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida was granted permission to no longer report AYP in Florida's ESEA Waiver.		

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*: 4.00%

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

**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.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) has designated five Regional Executive Directors to serve Florida's schools, specifically schools that receive School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds. These schools receive regular onsite visits that include reviews of budgets and instructional reviews to ensure the schools are making the progress needed. FDOE has provided webinars, state-wide technical assistance meetings, conference calls, and FAQs to the Districts/LEAs in receipt of funds related specifically to the implementation of the SIG 1003(g) intervention models.

**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 state determined that the most appropriate action was to reduce administrative funds and implement this action by placing a cap on the amount of indirect costs charged to the Title I, Part A project. These funds were then used to support the schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, and restructuring that contributed to the District/LEA being identified as a District/LEA in corrective action.

### 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	559,080
Applied to transfer	35,391
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	20,451
<b>Comments:</b> 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*.

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 14,012,434

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

**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.

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	897,428
Applied for supplemental educational services	82,608
Received supplemental educational services	61,363
<b>Comments:</b> 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*.

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 95,134,824
<b>Comments:</b> 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	2,281,649	2,171,095	95.15	110,554	4.85
All elementary classes	1,240,021	1,205,490	97.22	34,531	2.78
All secondary classes	1,041,628	965,605	92.70	76,023	7.30

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.

Florida uses a departmentalized approach.

**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	14.50
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	7.20
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	62.20
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category listed as "other" may be a course taught by, but not limited to, interim substitutes, long term substitutes, teachers needing to complete Reading Endorsements, Exceptional Student Education, and Social Studies course work.

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)	38.10
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	7.70
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)	54.20
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category listed as "other" may be a course taught by, but not limited to, interim substitutes, long term substitutes, teachers needing to complete Reading Endorsements, Exceptional Student Education, and Social Studies course work.

### 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	396,613	383,621	96.72
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	253,208	245,914	97.12
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	121,096	105,866	87.42
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	288,631	271,796	94.17

#### 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	84.20	43.10
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Priced Lunch Eligibility	
Secondary schools	73.30	36.00
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Priced Lunch Eligibility	

**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](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
No Response	Dual language	
No Response	Two-way immersion	
No Response	Transitional bilingual programs	
No Response	Developmental bilingual	
No Response	Heritage language	
No Response	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////
No Response	Structured English immersion	////////////////////
No Response	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////
No Response	Content-based ESL	////////////////////
No Response	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because Florida's labels are different for these data, it is unclear how we should answer this questions. These are the Instructional Models used in Florida to provide ELLs comprehensive instruction:

Sheltered - English  
 Sheltered - Core/Basic Subject Areas  
 Mainstream/Inclusion - English  
 Mainstream/Inclusion - Core/Basic Subject Areas  
 Maintenance and/or Developmental Bilingual Education  
 Dual Language (Two-way Developmental Bilingual Education)

**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	269,173
<b>Comments:</b> 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.	235,848
<b>Comments:</b> 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	193,032
Haitian; Haitian Creole	28,277
Vietnamese	2,982
Portuguese	2,769
Arabic	2,702

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	217,693
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	8,129
Total	225,822
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section (1.6.3.1.1) are populated by the data reported in EDFact file N137 LEP English Language Proficiency Test. The reporting period for N137 is the testing window, which in Florida is the spring semester. The data in section 1.6.2.1 are populated by data reported in EDFacts file N141 LEP Enrolled. The reporting period for N141 is the entire school year. The differences in the reporting period account for difference in data in 1.6.3.1.1 and 1.6.2.1. The data in 1.6.2.1 and 1.6.3.1.1 are correct per the guidance in EDFacts.</p> <p>There are several reasons why a student would be reported as 'not tested'. If a student misses one part of the assessment (listening/speaking, writing, reading) then they are considered 'not tested'. Also, we match students to survey 3 which is in February while the test is given later in the year. This difference in reporting period and testing period account for students who were reported as LEP but were not enrolled at the time of testing.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process: Florida does not collect the number of students not tested for each of the reasons described above.</p>	

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

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	31,628
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14.53
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	217,194
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	8,114
Total	225,308
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section (1.6.3.2.1) are populated by the data reported in EDFacts file N138 T3 LEP ELP Test. The reporting period for N138 is the testing window which in Florida is the spring semester. The data in section 1.6.2.2 are populated by data reported in EDFacts file N116 T3 LEP Students Served. The reporting period for N116 is the entire school year. The differences in reporting period account for the differences in the data in 1.6.3.2.1 and 1.6.2.2. Both sets of data are correct per guidance in EDFacts.</p> <p>There are several reasons why a student would be reported as 'not tested'. If a student misses one part of the assessment (listening/speaking, writing, reading) then they are considered 'not tested'. Also, we match students to survey 3 which is in February while the test is given later in the year. This difference in reporting period and testing period account for students who were reported as LEP but were not enrolled at the time of testing.</p> <p>Added during the Verification process: Florida does not collect the number of students not tested for each of the reasons described above.</p>	

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).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>	<b>#</b>
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.	55,349

**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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	49,195	30.40		
Attained proficiency	31,565	14.53		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. **Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not have a single state target for AMAO1 (progress). Instead Florida has different targets for AMAO1 (progress) on three separate assessments: Listening/Speaking (75%), Writing (59%) and Reading (61%). Students in Florida exceeded the target in writing and reading. The number and percent of students who met the target in Listening/Speaking is 91232 (72%); 79254 (63%) in Writing; and 81663 (64%) in Reading.

Florida does not have a single state target for AMAO2 (proficiency attainment). Instead Florida has different targets for

different grade clusters: K-2 (18%), 3-5 (21%), 6-8 (16%) and 9-12 (17%). Students in Florida met or exceeded the target in grade clusters K-2, 6-8, and 9-12. The number and percent of students who met the target in K-2 is 17657 (43%); grade cluster 3-5 is 8439 (18%); grade cluster 6-8 is 4323 (18%); grade cluster 9-12 is 4116 (17%).

The student counts for the Progress and Attainment targets (cited above in this comment) are duplicated for each assessment. That is, a student would be counted on each assessment that he or she made progress or attained proficiency overall. Shown in the Results column in 1.6.3.2.2 is a count of students who made progress or attained proficiency in all three assessments. Data have been verified as a result of the 2011-2012 Verification Process and are correct.

### 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
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess in Native Languages.	

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess in Native Languages.

**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)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess in Native Languages.

**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)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Florida does not assess in Native Languages.

**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
39,454	33,528	72,982
<b>Comments:</b> 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
54,694	S	59	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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
57,398	S	56	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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
10,942	S	42	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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 Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	49
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	21
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	15
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	2
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	20
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	48
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	48
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	44

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. Florida has one consortia requesting Title III funds. It is part of Polk County and their AMAO information is part of that district's AMAO results.

#### 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	_____ No
<b>Comments:</b> 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?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
<b>Comments:</b> 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
58,406	1,679	11

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.

Added during the Verification process:

There was a change in the way immigrant children were reported. Previously, Florida based it on Fund Source. 2011-2012 is the first year that Florida is reporting the number of immigrants receiving immigrant funds. The data was resubmitted during verification to reflect the most current numbers.



### 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.	45,680
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	0

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.

Florida's Consent Decree requires ESOL content are teachers to be ESOL endorsed or certified. To utilize Title III funds for certified/licensed teachers would be considered as supplanting instead of supplementing. Therefore, there are no data to collect.

\* 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.

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b>////////////////////////////////</b>
Instructional strategies for LEP students	61	////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	48	////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	46	////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	44	////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	38	////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	48	////////////////////////////////
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	65	15,745
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	12	428
PD provided to principals	30	255
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	18	51
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	33	1,026
PD provided to community based organization personnel	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>17,510</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" means "a survey course for content area teachers teaching English Language Learners."

The Total that is auto-calculated in column 1 (#Subgrantees) in Table 2 (Participant Information) is a duplicated subgrantee count.

### 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
07/01/11	07/01/11	64
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The funds were available 07-2011; however, the average number of days for distribution of funds can be skewed by districts that do not submit necessary changes in a timely manner.		

#### 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.

Florida met the distribution of funds to subgrantees on time.

**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>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> 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	33	33
LEAs with subgrants	41	41
Total	74	74
<b>Comments:</b> 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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	90	1,194
K	504	6,287
1	444	5,732
2	395	5,413
3	425	5,443
4	376	4,757
5	361	4,788
6	323	4,301
7	323	4,151
8	272	4,003
9	251	3,976
10	215	3,132
11	197	2,852
12	170	3,037
Ungraded	1	1
Total	4,347	59,067
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	434	9,210
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,647	43,370
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	144	1,333
Hotels/Motels	122	5,154
Total	4,347	59,067
<b>Comments:</b> 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	145
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,194
K	6,287
1	5,732
2	5,413
3	5,443
4	4,757
5	4,788
6	4,301
7	4,151
8	4,003
9	3,976
10	3,132
11	2,852
12	3,037
Ungraded	1
Total	59,212
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 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	6,350
Migratory children/youth	912
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,561
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	6,829
<b>Comments:</b> 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	4,134	1,612
4	3,609	1,603
5	3,582	1,506
6	3,069	1,167
7	2,916	1,130
8	2,750	1,034
High School	4,151	1,264
<b>Comments:</b> 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	4,128	1,644
4	3,629	1,532
5	3,601	1,336
6	3,102	981
7	2,931	1,033
8	2,752	978
High School	2,046	726
<b>Comments:</b> 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	3,196	1,102
6		
7		
8	2,394	681
High School	33	33
<b>Comments:</b> 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4,598
K	2,093
1	1,947
2	1,741
3	1,667
4	1,449
5	1,379
6	1,235
7	1,230
8	1,138
9	1,214
10	1,041
11	956
12	633
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5,395
Total	27,716
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

Since there was less than a 10 percent increase in Category 1 counts from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012, an explanation is not required.

**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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,047
K	437
1	470
2	415
3	291
4	285
5	243
6	223
7	193
8	208
9	168
10	151
11	114
12	9
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	271
Total	4,525
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

Since there was less than a 10 percent decrease in Category 2 counts from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012, an explanation is not required.

**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.

All local student data is transmitted to the state via an automated Management Information System (MIS) - the State of Florida Student Information Database System. The data are collected by the school districts through their local systems, and submitted to the state at pre-set times throughout the year, with a seven month window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. The districts use this same system to transmit the data that are used to calculate the migrant count. This year's count was obtained using the State of Florida Student Information Database using data submitted by districts in August 2012, via Survey 5, with updates and corrections up to October 5, 2012. Survey 5 differs from all other surveys in that it is a cumulative count of all students served in all programs during the preceding school year, and therefore captures all migrant students. For 2011-2012 Survey 5, the due date was August 3, 2012 with a state processing window of July 30 - August 31, 2012. State processing is the "clean up" window where districts can upload/delete/edit their data everyday. After the end of state processing, the state processes records every weekend. Districts have until February 28, 2013 to change their data; however, we finalize counts much sooner to be able to meet CSPR and EDEN timelines.

Last year's child counts were generated using the same system. In 2002, a data element was added to the Florida Student Information Database system the Migrant Status Term, Student Demographic Reporting Format. This data element uses a coding system to indicate whether the migrant child was served in the regular term, summer term, or both.

In Migrant Status Term, a separate code (Code X) is used for those identified as migrants, but received no services (neither academic nor support services; in the regular or summer term). In 2006, the coding used to indicate that the migrant child was served in the regular term (3) was revised to reflect that the migrant child was enrolled/served -- with services provided during the regular school day -- (D) or that the migrant child was enrolled/served -- with some or all services provided during extended day/week -- (E). Extensive technical assistance was provided to school districts to ensure the accuracy of this coding system, including regional workshops and presentations at Florida's annual Information Database Workshop held in June each year and at the technical assistance meeting/workshop usually held in the fall of each year.

### 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.

District Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff (recruiters/advocates/liaisons) identify eligible migrant children through face-to-face interviews and document their eligibility using a state approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. This form captures all the necessary data for identification and reporting: student name, parent names, Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD), TO/FROM city and state, date of birth, gender, race/ethnicity, country of birth, current school enrollment, etc.

Florida's guidelines require district MEPs to generate a new COE each time a migrant child makes a new qualifying move. In addition, district MEP staff is required to annually contact the child or the child's parent/guardian in order to update the child's COE. Documentation of this process is maintained at the district-level. District MEP staff is trained to verify the information on the COE, and enter it into the local Management Information Services (MIS) data bases. Districts transmit the student-level data from their local systems to Florida's Automated Student Database System in Survey 5. A complete description of the system used, along with a complete layout of the data elements, may be found at [http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/student\\_1112.asp](http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/student_1112.asp).

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) staff conducts annual on-site reviews that include re-interviewing selected families to ensure that the information on the COEs is accurate and that the children on the COE are eligible to receive Migrant Education Program services.

Migrant students whose eligibility expired during the regular school year, but may be receiving services under the "continuation of services" were filtered out of the counts based on their Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and Date of Birth (DOB). For 2012, we used a QAD range QAD > 08/31/08 through < or = 08/31/12 and DOB = 09/02/89 through 08/31/09, inclusive. Migrant eligible students were students with codes of D or E or S or B or X, while Migrant Served students had codes of D or E or S or B from the Migrant Status Term Data Element. Data elements used to report these fields can be found on FDOE's Student Database Manuals link - Migrant Status Term ([http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database\\_1112/148625.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1112/148625.pdf)), Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) for Migrant Program Eligibility ([http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database\\_1112/163975.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1112/163975.pdf)), and Birth Date ([http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database\\_1112/104025.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1112/104025.pdf)). To determine 11-12 Continuation of Services counts, we used Codes B or C only from the Migrant Continuation of Services (COS) data element ([http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database\\_1112/148056.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1112/148056.pdf)), used Term ([http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database\\_1112/176225.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1112/176225.pdf)) to determine if the student was served COS in the regular or Summer, the same DOB range as all other migrant specs, Date of Birth = 09/02/89 through 08/31/09, inclusive and Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) for Migrant Program Eligibility. We delete students with QAD = 00/00/0000 and EXTENDED QAD to include an additional year; (QAD > 08/31/2007 and < 09/01/2012) to specifically capture students that were receiving Continuation of Services.

In Migrant Status Term, a separate code (Code S) is used for those students identified as migrant, and Enrolled/Served ONLY in Summer Term. These students must be served in a partially or fully Migrant funded service component designed especially for Migrant students enrolled in conventional summer school (or intersession). District Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff identify (Code S) these served students and report them to the Florida Department of Education during Survey 5. For reporting 2011-2012 data, the Survey 5 due date was August 3, 2012, with state processing occurring July 30 - August 31, 2012.

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 from the Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) are entered locally, either at the school or the district level, aggregated for the whole district, and transmitted electronically during the required survey periods through Florida's Automated Student Information Database System. The Student Demographic Format collects student-level data on all students in Florida, including, but not limited to, Date of Birth, Qualifying Arrival Date, Country of Birth, and other information about services provided to qualified students. To obtain a student count, the database is queried for all students meeting the criteria for current migrant status in regular and summer categories.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same process was used to collect and maintain the state's Category 2 count.



### 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 database was queried for all children between the ages of 3 and 22 (Date of Birth range of 09/02/89 through 08/31/09, inclusive, which captures those who were 2 and turned 3 and those who were 21 and turned 22), whose Qualifying Arrival Date is greater than 08/31/08, with a valid Migrant Status Term Code, and an appropriate service for Summer session. This process is applied to all migrant child cases that are identified as migrant in the state student database and then the cases are sorted by Category I or II using the Migrant Status Term data element. Edit checks for Category I and Category II are performed on the data file generated by this query to delete children who may be included in error. With regards to verifying that those children whose 3rd birthday occurs during the eligibility period are still residing in the State before including them in the child count; on-site monitoring (conducted by State MEP staff) or basic district level quality control procedures being implemented, document a standard practice among district MEPs. It is a standard procedure that children who will turn 3 during the eligibility period are flagged by the data clerk (whose responsibility it is to input student data into the district database) at the beginning of each school year or at the time of interview or re-interview of a family. Before data is submitted for the reporting period (Survey 5), data clerks confer with recruiters to ensure that these children/families are still in the district.

The query used finds all migrant children identified within the eligibility reporting period. Since Survey 5 data are cumulative for the entire school year, all those meeting the eligibility requirements are captured, regardless of their length of stay. Recruiters are in constant contact with their families so that when a child turns 3 during the reporting period, district MEP staff will then identify that child as migrant on the student database. The data element Migrant Status Term identifies which term(s) a migratory child was served and/or identified. Further, migratory children selected for inclusion in the count from the State Student Database had to have a Qualifying Arrival Date greater than 08/31/08. State Student Database reporting procedures require that any migrant child, who had graduated at the end of the regular school year, would not have a record in the student database. FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "Continuation of Services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations.

In addition to the Migrant Status Term data element contained in the Student Demographic Format, data elements in the Federal/State Compensatory Evaluation Format, also transmitted in Survey 5, provide information regarding summer services to migrant students. The Summer school code (Category II) cannot be entered on a student without a link to a code for summer services. Each year, a comprehensive presentation is made at the State Database Workshop. This presentation targets migrant staff, data clerks, and MIS staff and covers all reporting requirements for migrant students and migrant program data. When the specific Migrant Status Term data element was created, very explicit definitions were developed and disseminated to MEP/MIS staff. Two of the codes were created to identify students who received services during the summer. The codes are "B" -- students who were served in both the regular 180 day school year AND the summer term and "S" -- students that were served only in the summer term. The definition for summer services states that a student must be served in a Federally Funded (partially or fully) program designed (in whole or part) especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Student enrolled in a conventional summer school must, additionally or concurrently, be provided services that are fully or partially Federal Funded and designed especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Summer programs and services that are funded partially or fully by migrant program funds are clearly highlighted in district Migrant Education Program Project applications and are corroborated by district logs and reviewed during on-site MEP monitoring visits. Districts have been provided guidance clarifying those children who receive instructional packets as a one-time act of providing instructional or support services cannot be included in their "summer count".

All students in Florida are assigned a unique, ten-digit Student Number Identifier, Florida (SID) number, consisting of the student's Social Security number followed by an "X". Those without Social Security numbers are assigned a SID by the local school district using a state defined methodology, which then becomes the student's State SID. Should a

student move, the receiving district is required to search the State's Student Locator system to determine if the student has prior enrollment history in any of Florida's public schools. If so, the SID which was originally assigned as the student's SID is to be assigned to the student in the receiving district. Please refer to: [http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database\\_1112/175625.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1112/175625.pdf). Because the SID is unique to each student, further matching is not performed at the state level.

For this year's count, the following process was used: A master file containing all the students in the state was generated and the students that met the federal criteria were coded as "Migrant". A separate data file containing only migrant students served in Regular and Summer sessions was generated. All records were matched and unduplicated by data element fields: Migrant Status Term, SID, District Number, and School Number. Because of the uniqueness of each student's SID, there is an assurance that data are unique for each student based upon Migrant Status Term data element and Florida Student Number Identifier. By using the SID and Migrant Status Term and matching for duplicate SID's, this methodology insures the data tables produce an unduplicated count for each session. When students are initially enrolled by district data staff, THEY must ensure that if a pre-existing SID is selected for a student, it must match on all variables, i.e., name, DOB, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, home language, and parent names, at a minimum, before assigning a new SID.

An additional measure to ensure that districts do not generate a new SID for a student with an existing SID will be to disseminate extensive guidance to district MEP and district data staff on nuances of Hispanic names and strongly encourage an in-depth probe of the State Student Locator system to identify such students before a new SID is issued.

Added during the Verification process:

It has been verified that the date values in the above comments are in fact consistent with what has been programmed and that these values guarantee that all children who were eligible and resident for at least one day during the performance period, such as those who reached age 22 or graduated from high school/attained a GED, are included in the Category 1 Count.

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 same process was used to generate the State's Category 2 counts.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Florida Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Office, established in 2006, plays an instrumental role in ensuring the proper and timely identification of migrant children in the state. The ID&R office includes a state ID&R Coordinator, a trainer, an administrative assistant and a data entry clerk. The ID&R office provides technical assistance and training to district MEPs on procedures and guidelines for eligibility, identification and recruitment; updating the procedures and forms (COEs) used by recruiters to meet accepted practices; and resolving questionable eligibility information on the COE forms with district MEP staff and other credible sources. The ID&R office updates the Florida ID&R Manual, develops quality control documents (which includes a COE checklist), modifies the COE, provides new instructions for appropriate COE completion, and meets with stakeholders and practitioners to develop and recommend eligibility policy to be accepted by the state.

The district MEPs have the responsibility of following the procedures and practices contained in the Florida ID&R Manual, develop a local Quality Control Plan, ensure that staff is aware of the local Quality Control Plan, as well as the procedures and guidelines for ID&R in Florida, and participating in workshops and/or conferences conducted or sponsored by the SEA and/or the ID&R Office. A new COE is generated for any new migrant child and existing COEs are updated annually for continued residency and age eligibility (through re-certification efforts).

Technical assistance is provided by the staff in the Florida Migrant Education Program Office or the ID&R Office, specializing in identification and recruitment procedures and practices to district and school-level migrant staff. Selected district MEPs are visited to ensure that the COEs are properly completed, reflect valid eligibility determinations and are submitted to local MIS offices for transmission to the State in a timely manner. This practice has been incorporated in annual, prescheduled monitoring activities for all Federal Programs, but remains a standalone activity for MEP Programs (at the discretion of the State) in districts that may not be targeted for monitoring. The following Quality Control Procedures incorporate the steps the State will take to ensure the integrity of the eligibility determinations made by district MEPs and the accuracy of migrant child data collected and submitted:

- a. The initial eligibility determination of a student is made through face-to-face interviews with a parent, guardian, other responsible adult or an out of school youth traveling on his/her own.
- b. The SEA provides state-wide Identification and Recruitment training at least once a year to all staff. Training is provided more frequently to individual districts by request or by triggers that may surface during the annual district COE review. During these trainings, MEP eligibility factors, interviewing skills, COE completion and quality control training are provided to enhance the level of knowledge of veteran and new staff. In 2012, seven (7) regional training events were conducted throughout the state to discuss the basic core of eligibility requirements, update on migrant policy from the state, review updates to the ID&R handbook, discuss updates to the COE, review issues regarding the ID&R and service delivery of OSY, and review any new federal regulations and the potential impact on current ID&R procedures. In addition, over 15 site visits to districts were conducted to discuss ID&R and eligibility issues. Finally, ongoing communication via telephone and electronic mail is maintained with all districts.
- c. Florida, in collaboration with ESCORT and the ID&R Office, continuously revises their Identification and Recruitment Manual. A revised version will be posted in 2013 in [www.flrecruiters.org](http://www.flrecruiters.org), the Florida's ID&R Office website. MEP staff is expected to follow the guidelines of the draft NRG along with all other guidance as disseminated by the Florida MEP.
- d. The COE was modified to facilitate the collection of information by recruiters and to align the items with similar forms used in other states. The COE reflects the changes and new regulations implemented by the OME. The 2012-2013 COE was delivered to districts in August, prior to the start of school. The form includes OME developed "Qualifying Move and Work" section required in all COEs. Based on the federal program regulations from 2009, the ID&R office provided guidance to districts regarding how to accurately complete the COE and document "economic necessity" and "temporary employment." The COE also includes a section to include specific information regarding OSY - last grade attended, where and when. In 2011, one of the key modifications to the form was the addition of a printed COE number. This number facilitates the monitoring and quality control efforts from the ID&R office. Training on the use of this form was provided to districts during the 2012 Spring Regional Training events. To provide further assistance to districts and migrant staff, a presentation and a handout highlighting the key changes to the form were made available during the training and on the Florida ID&R Office website at [www.flrecruiter.org](http://www.flrecruiter.org).
- e. The proper chain of command for resolving eligibility issues is that the recruiter brings the issue to local MEP staff and the

Coordinator; if the issue is still unclear, the Coordinator can refer the issue to the state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. The state ID&R coordinator will research for similar situations and prior determinations that may facilitate a decision. Also, the ID&R coordinator will contact other districts as well as practitioners in other states who, in a confidential manner, will provide feedback. If a clear determination cannot be made, the issue is submitted to the Office of Migrant Education (OME). When possible, the FL-MEP will include the state's position or recommendation in the issue. The response from OME is shared with all local MEP staff.

f. It is a standard operating procedure to verify the migrant child data extracted from the State student database with the migrant student data submitted at the district level. Files of these data are provided to districts for that purpose. Windows of opportunities to correct/revise/delete migrant child records are given to district MEPs to ensure that all students captured for state funding purposes are eligible migrant children.

g. An e-newsletter is sent to recruitment staff across the state. Through the newsletter, recruiters and other migrant staff are kept informed of eligibility and policy guidance affecting the state. Also, the newsletter provides information on upcoming training events and resources from the field. Currently, there are over 200 migrant personnel registered to receive the newsletter. In addition, the ID&R office sends information to district migrant coordinators separately.

h. A COE database has been developed and implemented by the ID&R office. The database collects the information of every COE completed by recruiters in the state. The data clerk also serves as an extra quality control reviewer - prior to entry, every COE is reviewed and, when necessary, corrections and clarifications are requested to local districts. Communication with districts regarding clarifications on COEs has become an established routine of the ID&R Office (using the already mentioned COE number to protect confidentiality of students). The ID&R office identifies "common trends" and uses the information to provide training to recruitment staff.

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.

Upon submission of the 2006 Re-Interview Initiative Report the FLDOE began the process of implementing the corrective actions described therein. The state has conducted statewide and regional training activities with recruitment staff regarding making proper eligibility determinations. In addition, LEAs were trained on how to corroborate information provided by families on the COEs. A state ID&R manual has been completed and disseminated, as well as specific quality control documents (re-interview form and instructions). An ID&R Office was established and staff was hired to specifically manage recruitment issues throughout the state. Staff from the ID&R office conducts multiple training events throughout the year to migrant staff. Significant changes to the COE were implemented, and key stakeholders were involved in recommending policy and guidance regarding eligibility to the state.

At the local level, key corrective actions have been implemented as well. Many LEAs have initiated local re-interview processes using the protocols, instructions, and forms developed by the state. The districts conduct re-interviews on an ongoing basis to validate eligibility determinations, particularly in situations where there is recently hired staff and unusual eligibility circumstances. The districts ensure that recruitment staff participates in all ID&R-related training provided by the state. In addition, the LEAs compiled a list of the major qualifying activities in their area, and this information is maintained at the [www.flrecruiter.org](http://www.flrecruiter.org).

The districts also communicate, on a regular basis, with the ID&R office to discuss eligibility questions and review particular cases. Based on the number of questions received and the content of such questions, the ID&R Office provides guidance, through the e-newsletter, to clarify any ongoing issues related to eligibility determinations. In addition, the ID&R Office continuously schedules training with new staff at the districts.

Districts conduct rolling re-interview efforts to ensure that proper eligibility determinations are made. A re-interview form, instructions and protocol, developed by the ID&R office, are used in every local re-interview efforts conducted in the state. Districts are instructed to randomly select the sample for the re-interviews. If requested, the ID&R office can assist districts in conducting re-interviews. Results of the rolling re-interview efforts are reported every year to the ID&R office. When a re-interview indicates that a child or family are not eligible, the district must inform the SEA and the ID&R office, remove the child from the local and state database, and inform the family of the determination. Sample letters to inform families of the re-interview findings are provided in the ID&R office's website.

In the 2011-2012 school year, Florida districts conducted 570 rolling re-interviews. Re-interviews were attempted from a sample of 740 students, for a completion rate of 77%. Of the completed rolling re-interviews, nine (9) were determined not eligible, or 1.6%. Districts notified the Florida state office and the ID&R office about the ineligible children, who were removed from the state and COE database.

In addition, an external agency was hired to conduct 100 external, independent re-interviews (JBS, Inc.). At the time of the completion of this report, 83 re-interviews were completed. Of these, 3 had COE errors and only one was tentatively determined ineligible. However, a final report has yet been received and districts have not had an opportunity to challenge or offer clarifying information, as recommended by the OME-produced re-interviewing guide.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The revised data element allows FDOE to produce preliminary reports and distribute these to school districts for further verification. Also, each District Migrant Coordinator is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the electronic records match the information on the COEs before the records are transmitted electronically to the State.

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.

The following verification process was used: A file broken down by LEA/district level containing student counts of all students reported in the data element Migrant Status Term code was sent to both MEP and MIS staff in each district on August 15, 2012. Additional data runs and opportunities for correction (August 27, 2012, September 4, and September 19, 2012) were provided to districts prior to the final run. Districts had until September 21, 2012 (final run) to verify this data and submit any corrections to the SEA.

Districts were to use the file to verify the accuracy of data coded into the state student data base system. Both the district Migrant Coordinator and district MIS Directors were provided with these data files. FLDOE advised all district MEP and MIS staff to work collaboratively to ensure that the student counts were accurate, unduplicated and that each student record met the No Child Left Behind Act definition of a migrant student. School districts were allowed to make updates to their data up to the last possible moment to ensure the greatest degree of accuracy possible. Analysts in the Department then produced the final migrant student count on December 4, 2012 using the data set/file containing all corrections made by school districts during the verification phase.

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.

In 2012, the Florida ID&R Office expanded their local rolling re-interview effort to include all districts. Districts were instructed to use the re-interview form, instructions and protocols developed by the state available at [www.flrecruiter.org](http://www.flrecruiter.org). Previous efforts suggested that re-interviews are conducted at times when the families are in the area and take into consideration the size of the district and the number of children enrolled in the local program. In 2011-12, 570 re-interviews were conducted throughout the state.

If needed, corrective actions will include:

- Increased visits by FLDOE/ID&R Office staff to specific districts;
- Accompany recruiters during ID&R efforts to identify errors, mistakes in interviewing techniques;
- Review of additional COEs to identify error patterns;
- Provide specific training to districts with high defect rates; and
- Conduct re-interviews with non-LEA personnel.

The ID&R office continues to maintain a COE database. The purpose of the database is to maintain information regarding qualifying moves, qualifying works and other eligibility related information. The database also serves as a quality control effort, since every form is reviewed by the data clerk.

A prospective re-interview was conducted in 2011. Seventy five (75) re-interviews were conducted in the Spring of 2011. Out-of-state interviewers were used to conduct this process. The COE database was used to randomly select the re-interview sample. Review of the interviews is currently in process.

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.

The FLDOE Migrant Education Program is assured of the accuracy of the migrant child counts reported for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. Florida conducted 399 rolling re-interviews at the local level. Of those, five (5) were determined non-eligible representing 1.25% error rate. Districts are instructed to take the following actions when a COE is determined to be not

eligible:

- Contact parent/child (if OSY) and notify of results from re-interview.
- Remove children from local database.
- Notify SEA to ensure child(ren) is/are removed from the state database.
- Send to ID&R office results of eligibility determination