

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**

NEVADA



**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: Nevada	
Address: 700 E. Fifth St. Carson City, NV 89701	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Julian Montoya	
Telephone: 775-687-9255	
Fax: 775-687-9118	
e-mail: jmontoya@doe.nv.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Julian Montoya	
<div style="text-align: right;">Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 4:05:23 PM</div> <div>Signature</div>	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

State has revised or changed	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	2015-2016	2012-2013	N/A

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

Full implementation of the ELA CCSS will be in place by the end of the 2012-2013 school year. Full implementation of the Mathematics CCSS in grades K-8 (and targeted instruction in grades 9-10) will be completed by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. Full implementation in grades 10 and 11 will be accomplished by the end of 2014-2015, and in grade 12 by 2015-2016. The above description/timeline applies to the alternate assessment in ELA and Mathematics.

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.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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.

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	2013-2014	2012-2013	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	2015-2016	2012-2013	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2015-2016	2012-2013	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2015-2016	2012-2013	N/A

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	2014-2015	2014-2015	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2014-2015	2014-2015	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014/2015	N/A

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

New items aligned only to the CCSS are currently being written, field testing began in spring of 2012. During each of the test administrations in 2013 and 2014, up to 15% of the live items on the Reading and Mathematics tests will be replaced by the new items. The addition of the new CCSS items to the live assessments has been designed to follow the statewide instructional implementation of these standards. Alternate assessment items for both ELA and Mathematics are following the same structure as described above.

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)	75.00
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	25.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	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)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
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	Yes
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	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	232,999	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,611	>=99
Asian	S	13,868	>=99
Black or African American	S	22,598	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	92,851	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	2,915	>=99
White	S	85,949	>=99
Two or more races	S	12,189	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	24,359	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	28,467	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	128,705	>=99
Migratory students	S	42	>=95
Male	S	119,501	>=99
Female	S	113,495	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number for #Students Participating for Math-Males should be, 119,502.

The number for #Students Participating for Math-Females should be, 113,497.

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	6,344	26.04
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,910	65.31
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,105	8.64
Total	24,359	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	233,018	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,614	>=99
Asian	S	13,875	>=99
Black or African American	S	22,602	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	92,884	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	2,915	>=99
White	S	85,923	>=99
Two or more races	S	12,187	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	24,361	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	28,481	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	128,732	>=99
Migratory students	S	42	>=95
Male	S	119,486	>=99
Female	S	113,529	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number for #Students Participating for Math-Males should be, 119,487. The number for #Students Participating for Math-Females should be, 113,531.			

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	12,880	52.87
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,361	38.43
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,120	8.70
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	24,361	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	97,982	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,147	>=99
Asian	S	6,049	>=99
Black or African American	S	9,476	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	38,220	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,221	>=99
White	S	36,825	>=99
Two or more races	S	5,037	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	9,896	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	8,496	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	50,408	>=99
Migratory students	S	20	>=90
Male	S	49,818	>=99
Female	S	48,163	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number for #Students Participating for Math Females should be, 48,164.			

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	3,590	36.28
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,473	55.31
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	833	8.42
Total	9,896	////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,365	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	346	S	60
Asian	1,835	S	87
Black or African American	3,207	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	13,667	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	417	S	73
White	11,988	S	81
Two or more races	1,903	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,528	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,687	S	58
Economically disadvantaged students	19,952	S	65
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,146	S	73
Female	16,219	S	72

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported. Migrant student data was not reported within our state longitudinal data base for this year. This problem will be corrected for the 2012-2013 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,397	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	347	S	50
Asian	1,835	S	77
Black or African American	3,210	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	13,693	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	417	S	58
White	11,989	S	74
Two or more races	1,904	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,535	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,704	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	19,982	S	51
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,165	S	58
Female	16,232	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported. Migrant student data was not reported within our state longitudinal data base for this year. This problem will be corrected for the 2012-2013 CSPR.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Nevada only test in grades 5, 8, and 11 for Science.			

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	33,567	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	364	S	59
Asian	1,924	S	89
Black or African American	3,172	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	13,920	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	416	S	74
White	11,988	S	82
Two or more races	1,781	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,847	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,002	S	51
Economically disadvantaged students	19,909	S	65
Migratory students	10	S	60
Male	17,251	S	72
Female	16,316	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

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	33,579	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	365	S	59
Asian	1,924	S	84
Black or African American	3,177	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	13,926	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	416	S	72
White	11,988	S	81
Two or more races	1,781	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,846	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,003	S	37
Economically disadvantaged students	19,922	S	61
Migratory students	10	S	30
Male	17,252	S	66
Female	16,327	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Nevada only tests in grade 5, 8, and 11 for Science.			

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	34,009	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	369	S	59
Asian	2,009	S	87
Black or African American	3,251	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	14,020	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	384	S	76
White	12,207	S	79
Two or more races	1,767	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,731	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,635	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	19,989	S	64
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,367	S	70
Female	16,642	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

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	34,026	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	370	S	60
Asian	2,011	S	80
Black or African American	3,255	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	14,024	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	384	S	70
White	12,211	S	79
Two or more races	1,769	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,731	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,637	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	20,002	S	56
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,379	S	63
Female	16,647	S	70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,011	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	370	S	55
Asian	2,009	S	76
Black or African American	3,253	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	14,024	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	383	S	61
White	12,204	S	77
Two or more races	1,766	S	70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,730	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,635	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	19,994	S	49
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,372	S	62
Female	16,639	S	60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,747	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	S	63
Asian	1,980	S	90
Black or African American	3,371	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	13,504	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	398	S	75
White	12,446	S	84
Two or more races	1,679	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,593	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,478	S	37
Economically disadvantaged students	19,419	S	67
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,623	S	73
Female	16,124	S	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,742	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	S	47
Asian	1,982	S	75
Black or African American	3,377	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	13,499	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	398	S	57
White	12,436	S	72
Two or more races	1,681	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,592	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,471	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	19,417	S	50
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,619	S	55
Female	16,123	S	65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Nevada only tests in grade 5, 8, and 11 for Science.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,999	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	388	S	65
Asian	2,071	S	90
Black or African American	3,317	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	13,425	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	454	S	75
White	12,573	S	82
Two or more races	1,766	S	79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,458	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,781	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	18,822	S	65
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,486	S	71
Female	16,513	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,000	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	389	S	44
Asian	2,073	S	75
Black or African American	3,321	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	13,426	S	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	455	S	56
White	12,565	S	69
Two or more races	1,766	S	66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,460	S	16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,782	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	18,822	S	46
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,488	S	51
Female	16,512	S	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported. Migrant student data was not reported within our state longitudinal data base for this year. This problem will be corrected for the 2012-2013 CSPR.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Nevada only tests in grade 5, 8, and 11 for Science.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,421	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	411	S	51
Asian	2,008	S	84
Black or African American	3,248	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	13,226	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	425	S	63
White	12,402	S	72
Two or more races	1,697	S	70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,313	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,035	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	17,729	S	53
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,095	S	59
Female	16,326	S	65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,426	S	49
American Indian or Alaska Native	414	S	38
Asian	2,008	S	66
Black or African American	3,247	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	13,236	S	39
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	426	S	44
White	12,394	S	62
Two or more races	1,697	S	56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,316	S	13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,038	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	17,739	S	38
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,100	S	42
Female	16,326	S	56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,328	S	50
American Indian or Alaska Native	414	S	39
Asian	2,007	S	69
Black or African American	3,230	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	13,187	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	423	S	44
White	12,369	S	65
Two or more races	1,694	S	59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,308	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,028	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	17,667	S	38
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	17,042	S	52
Female	16,286	S	48
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEP data is correct as reported.			

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	30,891	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	366	S	71
Asian	2,041	S	88
Black or African American	3,032	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	11,089	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	421	S	79
White	12,345	S	83
Two or more races	1,596	S	81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,889	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,849	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	12,885	S	64
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	15,534	S	73
Female	15,357	S	73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct as presented.			

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	30,848	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	362	S	72
Asian	2,042	S	84
Black or African American	3,015	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	11,080	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	419	S	80
White	12,340	S	87
Two or more races	1,589	S	84
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,881	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,846	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	12,848	S	68
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	15,484	S	74
Female	15,364	S	80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct as presented.			

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	30,643	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	363	S	74
Asian	2,033	S	82
Black or African American	2,993	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	11,009	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	415	S	72
White	12,252	S	86
Two or more races	1,577	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,858	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,833	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	12,747	S	63
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	15,404	S	76
Female	15,239	S	71
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct as presented.			

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	653	293	44.87
Districts	18	10	55.56

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

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	172	50	29.07
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	166	47	28.31
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	6	3	50.00

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

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
16	10	62.50

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

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	105
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	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
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	82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Nevada school districts that chose the "other" option for restructuring were required to demonstrate that the LEA had taken a far more proactive role in providing technical assistance and monitoring for these low-performing schools. The approach was two pronged: the LEA had to demonstrate that it was demanding more accountability from the school in carrying out the actions outlined in the school's restructuring plan, and it had to show, to the SEA's satisfaction, that more technical assistance and support was being provided to the school in carrying out the restructuring plan. For instance, if specific professional development for teachers was required under the restructuring plan, the LEA had to demonstrate how it would follow up after the professional development to ensure that those practices were indeed being implemented in classrooms, and it had to describe what would happen if the teachers were unable or unwilling to change their instructional practices after the professional development was provided. Through this method, the LEA was required both to provide support and to demand accountability for change in these low-performing schools.

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 one school district in Nevada that is currently identified as being in Needs Improvement, Elko CSD, is receiving focused support this school year. The school district is receiving technical assistance in this regard from both the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) and an external consultant paid with Title I 1003(a) funds. This support involves reviewing the district's curriculum, instruction, assessment, accountability, and leadership capacity systems against a rubric for district improvement that was developed by the NDE in collaboration with WestEd, the Southwest Comprehensive Center, and RMC Research Corporation. This process includes an analysis of the district's systems using the Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Audit Tool for Districts (NCCAT-D). Based upon the results of this audit and in consultation with the NDE and the external consultant, the school district will develop a comprehensive improvement plan to address areas of need and build upon the identified district strengths.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	4	1
Schools	104	104
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	9/28/12
---	---------

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 3.40%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several of Nevada's LEAs had reductions in their respective Title I-A allocations for 2011-2012, so, although Clark CSD, Nevada's largest school district, did not receive a reduction which would have in turn reduced the amount set aside under 1003(a), there was still a reduction from the 4% set aside required.

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 Nevada Department of Education (NDE) partnered with WestEd and the Southwest Comprehensive Center to provide monitoring, technical assistance, and evaluation of its SIG-served schools and districts. The overall purpose of this collaboration was to monitor implementation of each school's selected intervention model (all SIG-served schools implemented either the turnaround or transformation model), identify potential areas of support needed, and monitor progress of each school towards attainment of the LEA-established goals for that school. Monitoring and evaluation was structured through the following procedures: 1)- bi-monthly onsite visits to each SIG-served school utilizing pre-established interview and focus group protocol based upon a rubric built to ensure successful implementation; 2)- school and district monthly upload/update around the various components of its SIG plan into the online school improvement planning system available through WestEd's Tracker system (known as eNOTE in Nevada); and 3)- written monitoring and evaluation reports developed for each school and district based upon the outcomes from each onsite monitoring visit and the corresponding evidence within eNOTE. In addition, the NDE provided SIG administrative funding to all SIG-served schools and districts for participation of principals and district leadership teams in the University of Virginia School Turnaround Specialist Program. While one district became a member of the first cohort to join the SWCC/UVA partnership to represent the State of Nevada in the summer of 2011, two additional districts signed on to become members of the second cohort in the summer of 2012. During the initial summer program, the districts and schools were able to develop and adopt school turnaround competencies for teachers, leaders, and district personnel working in and with SIG schools with the intent to share the process with the rest of the district in the future. In conclusion, NDE provided additional resources to support increased learning time in all 14 cohort I and II SIG schools for the 2012-2013 school year.

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.

Due to the continued economic downturn in Nevada's economy and the continuing decrease in state funding for all programs, Nevada's legislature has not allocated any additional funding to support school improvement since 2007.

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	74,941
Applied to transfer	1,190
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,060
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,668,436

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	1

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. Pershing County is the only district that cannot provide school choice as it has only 1 middle school.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	52,778
Applied for supplemental educational services	12,625
Received supplemental educational services	11,385
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 12,460,574
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	46,436	44,411	95.64	423	0.91
All elementary classes	11,256	10,833	96.24	423	3.76
All secondary classes	35,180	33,578	95.45	1,602	4.55

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	13.60
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	86.40
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	34.90
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	65.10
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	3,273	3,111	95.05
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	2,770	2,656	95.88
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	9,161	8,671	94.65
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	6,614	6,420	97.07

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	75.00	31.00
Poverty metric used	FRL	
Secondary schools	57.00	23.00
Poverty metric used	FRL	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////
<input type="checkbox"/> No Response	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	79,347
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	74,901
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	67,583
Tagalog	1,693
Chinese	594
Philippine (Other)	510
Vietnamese	487

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	71,254
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,588
Total	77,842
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers are correct as stated.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11,475
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.42
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	71,115
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,588
Total	77,703
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy between the 74,901 reported in 1.6.2.2 and the 71,115 exists because the number not tested includes the number of students who moved before or came after the testing window. If the students not tested for this latter reason were removed from the total of 74,901, then the number would be correct.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	13,813

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	35,675	62.26	29,543	53.00
Attained proficiency	10,765	15.14	8,138	14.60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NA

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NA

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
8,165	7,308	15,473
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
15,463	S	76	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
15,466	S	61	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,494	S	44	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	State made AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 but didn't meet AMAO 3

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u> </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
6,826	125	5

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,742
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	5,531

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	10	////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	9	////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	10	////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	8	////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	10	////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	2	////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	11,587
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	10	1,209
PD provided to principals	10	347
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	8	1,630
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	7	1,507
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	260
Total	49	16,540

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Carson City provided Path to Proficiency - Thinking Maps Lander County provided Implementing Data Teams - All students

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
		15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Received July 1 and available July 15		

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.

Not Applicable

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	11	11
LEAs with subgrants	6	6
Total	17	17
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	72	169
K	766	389
1	676	381
2	597	295
3	551	310
4	551	273
5	531	253
6	436	274
7	454	261
8	410	254
9	377	150
10	384	171
11	447	174
12	524	223
Ungraded	8	2
Total	6,784	3,579
Comments: 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	358	470
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,853	2,801
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	155	61
Hotels/Motels	1,418	315
Total	6,784	3,647
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. -2 is included in this count and not in 1.9.1.1. Next year these numbers will be included in the original report.		

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	68
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	241
K	1,155
1	1,057
2	892
3	861
4	824
5	784
6	710
7	715
8	664
9	527
10	555
11	621
12	747
Ungraded	10
Total	10,431
Comments: 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	135
Migratory children/youth	5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,165
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,242
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	705	304
4	642	359
5	625	333
6	568	264
7	569	216
8	498	161
High School	449	281

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

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	703	387
4	641	368
5	625	368
6	569	342
7	570	315
8	498	208
High School	451	247

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

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	625	296
6		
7		
8	494	147
High School	449	244

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

- a. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.
- b. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	28
K	24
1	17
2	9
3	10
4	17
5	17
6	12
7	11
8	6
9	10
10	8
11	4
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	176
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable- not greater or lesser than 10%

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	6
1	6
2	1
3	2
4	3
5	3
6	0
7	1
8	0
9	3
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	35
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For 2010-11, only one Nevada LEA operated a Migrant summer program; the increase of Category 2 students in 2011-12 reflects a second LEA operating a Migrant summer program.

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.

Three years ago, Nevada completed a transition from using MIS 2000 to using MAPs, an electronic recording system provided by the Education Research and Training Corporation (ERTC). Child counts for Category 1 are captured into MAPs as part of the COE approval process; child counts for Category 2 are input by recruiters into the system and then double checked against summer program attendance and participation sheets for accuracy.

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.

Category 1 Child Counts: Each year new COEs are generated by each of the districts participating in or wanting to participate in the Migrant Education Program. Nevada requires districts to use the National COE form and satisfy all requirements for the form and for proper qualification. The districts maintain a physical copy at their site and submit an electronic version into the MAPs system for approval. Using face to face interviews, each of the local recruiters completes a new COE for all migrant youth each year. The identified recruiter in each district has the responsibility for completing the COE for each child. The recruiters are encouraged to complete the COE immediately upon the identification of the migrant child, and thus COEs are completed at any time during the year. The Nevada Department of Education employs a Nevada Migrant Education Coordinator to review and approve each COE. COEs that are not acceptable are designated as such with an explanation and are rejected as not part of the active, approved data for the system; those needing corrections or additional information cannot be processed until they are completed and corrections are made. Communications between recruiters and the data coordinator are copied to the Nevada Department of Education Directors.

Districts are required to electronically submit data for the Category 2 list of Migrant youth participating in summer school programs as part of the student information tied to the COEs. Districts verified their counts and information independent of the MAPs system. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Directors review and approve data submitted prior to the information being finalized and reports being generated.

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.

Nevada's electronic system for Migrant student identification and data management, MAPs, interfaces with MSIX. Each child on each COE is individually reviewed for accuracy by name and birthdate, and matched to a unique state identification number that is captured into MSIX. The Migrant Data Coordinator verifies that the individual students proposed for approval on the COE are not identified as Migrant in a different district through the state ID; MAPs will not allow a student to be identified in multiple districts; MSIX resources help ascertain that a student is not split into two identities. The state MEP Directors are copied on each transaction to approve COEs, and randomly verify selected COEs.

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.

N/A

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.

Category 1: The COE forms and approval process from the MAPS system are designed to capture the following information: 1) That the child is between the ages of 3-21; 2) That the child had not graduated from high school; 3) That the date was within 36 months of the QAD; and 4) That the child has had his/her 3rd birthday before August 31, 2010 and was still resident after the birthday occurred.

The MAPS system is designed to determine each student's eligibility and COEs are not approved and activated in the system until the Data Coordinator has verified eligibility and completed forms. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Directors verify the process and the COEs in the MAPs system and by way of annual site monitor. The SEA reviews all COEs for accuracy and completeness prior to their being accepted into the computer system, and the computer program determines duplication.

The Migrant summer school program count is reported at the end of the summer school session by each participating district. The district completes an enrollment list that includes child identifying information and submits this list to the Department of Education to verify that information is accurately updated into the student/district profiles in MAPs. The form used by each district to submit the data includes the name of the school, the dates of the summer school session and the signature of the local migrant education coordinator. Input into the MAPS system verifies that each child identified is a valid migrant education participant included in the Category 1 child count on the MAPS system.

The MAPS system determines that the combination of the name and birth date of the individual child is an unduplicated combined name and birth date for the summer school program. If duplication is discovered, the program automatically checks for mother's name to determine if a record is duplicated. The computer program highlights names it has classified as duplicates, and the data entry clerk reviews this list. The program also verifies that the child is included in the Category 1 component of the system. The count for Category 2 includes students who have attended the summer school program sponsored totally, or in part, by Title I, Part C funds. The summer school student list is available to both the SEA and the LEA for review and verification.

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.

N/A

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 SEA verifies recruitment procedures and documentation as part of the yearly site monitor of LEAs. Yearly training and refreshing of policy and practice, including updates for revised or new policy, is mandatory for all Nevada Migrant Recruiters.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2011-12 reinterviews were focused on a 100% review of our largest district and were conducted by an independent party. Given our low incidence of Migrant students, guidance from our OME Program Officer recommends a minimum of 30 random re-interviews. Going forward, our procedure will be to accomplish reinterviews for a minimum of 30 randomly selected students each year. The intent will be for face to face interviews, but up to 50% of the interviews may be conducted by telephone if necessitated by logistics. Interviews will be effected by a combination of the following personnel: 2012-13 and 2013-14; State Migrant Director and Nevada LEA Recruiters from different LEAs than those where the interview is conducted. For 2014-15 reinterviews will be contracted from an independent third party. A Nevada re-interview tool will be developed and appropriate personnel will be trained to ensure consistent, valid process.

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.

In addition to items previously addressed, Nevada has eight (8) professional staff positions at the Department of Education who are assigned responsibility for oversight of Title I, Part A; Title I, School Improvement; and Title III activities in specified school districts. During the school year, these Title I and Title III Consultants make periodic site visits to each of the districts to provide technical assistance and oversight of the Title I and Title III programs. These visits verify that students are receiving required services and assistance with specific emphasis on meeting the educational needs of the migrant and LEP students. During the spring of each year, the assigned Title I Consultant conducts a formal review where a prescribed checklist is used to determine compliance with Title I, Part A requirements. One of the questions asked of principals and other site- specific staff is how the needs of the migrant students are being met through the Title I services. Those schools who are unable to provide an acceptable response to the question are identified in the formal report sent to the district and those schools are offered technical assistance in ways to meet the education needs of migrant students.

The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director also conducts periodic visits to all programs/districts receiving migrant education funds. Most visits are informal in nature and are designed to provide technical assistance and guidance to local personnel. However, during the spring of each year, a formal monitor visit is conducted where all programs respond to specific questions and are asked to provide specific documentation verifying appropriate activities and records. During this visit, the program's records are reviewed to determine if the information is in agreement with the data submitted on the COEs into the MAPS system. The monitor visit includes interviews with local program providers, youth participants, and parents as well as district administrative personnel. The SEA thus determines if students are receiving the educational services needed, first by Title I, Part A and then by Title I, Part C. In general, most students served by the Migrant Education are also receiving services of Title III for Limited English Proficient students.

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 Nevada Migrant Data Coordinator manages the initial input and approval of the data in the MAPS computer system. When each district completes a COE on a new child, the district retains a copy of the COE and the original input in the MAPS system is reviewed by the data coordinator. At the conclusion of the eligibility period, the data coordinator reviews

all of the COEs for accuracy, completeness and to verify there is no duplication of students. A district list is available in MAPs to each district for review and comment. If there is a concern stated from any of the involved parties, the data input person, the State Migrant Education Director, and the district coordinator jointly review the identified records. After all district, input review and paper reviews are completed, the SEA does a final review of all COEs.

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.

Nevada did not have a Migrant Data Coordinator during most of the 2011-12 Migrant year. Also, the previous State Migrant Director retired during the year. We are very fortunate that two Nevada Department of Education Program Professionals share the Director responsibilities and that a competent, precise data coordinator has been contracted. The error that was identified through the re-interview process was implemented prior to the Data Coordinator. In response, she reviewed every COE for accuracy; even though she found no more eligibility issues, she corrected numerous data inconsistencies and retrained the recruiters to be precise in their submissions. The majority of inconsistencies related to updated information, such as current student grade. The State Migrant Directors, the Data Coordinator, and the Program Directors of the two most populous Migrant Districts form a Program Advisory Group for the state. In conjunction with all of the LEA Migrant Directors, this team will define re-interview protocols for this current year.

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.

At this time, Nevada is satisfied with the accuracy of the reported child counts and the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. However, we feel that we are not identifying all of the Migrant eligible students that we should. The state Migrant Directors are working to train recruiters in the use of MSIX, and to train Title I personnel in districts that have not had Migrant students, to identify and serve students entering their district with a non-qualifying move who still have Migrant eligibility remaining.