

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

MINNESOTA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Minnesota Dept of Ed		
Address: 1500 Highway 36 W Roseville MN		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Greg Marcus		
Telephone: 651-582-8454		
Fax: 651-582-8727		
e-mail: greg.marcus@state.mn.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jessie Montano		
		Friday, March 7, 2008, 5:29:40 PM
Signature		Date

More data coming when CSPR Part II data submission is reopened. Thanks!

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Subject specific content standards are on a schedule to be revised every 9 years. Below are the years in which the most recent revision occurred or will be occurring.

2006-07 Mathematics standards revised; to be implemented by schools in 2010-11.

2008-09 Science standards will be revised; to be implemented by schools in 2011-12.

2009-10 Language Arts standards will be revised; to be implemented by schools in 2012-13.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All assessments are on schedule to be revised to match the standards. The revisions stated in 1.1.1 will be assessed using the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments-Series III (MCA-III) for general education students and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) for the most significant cognitively disabled students (alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards). Alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards are being considered but timeline for implementation has not yet been determined. All items are created and field tested at least one year before they are operational.

Mathematics

2007-08 - Mathematics test specifications written to revised standards

2008-09 - Mathematics items field tested

2010-11 - Mathematics operational for grades 3-8

2013-14 - Mathematics operational for grade 11

Language Arts

2010-11 - Language Arts test specifications written to revised standards

2011-12 - Language Arts items field tested

2012-13 - Language Arts operational

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All academic achievement standards will be finalized during standard setting the year the test goes operational. Alternate and modified achievement standards would be finalized in the same years for the respective contents.

2010-11 Mathematics academic achievement standards revised for grades 3-8.

2013-14 Mathematics academic achievement standards revised for grade 11.

2012-13 Language Arts academic achievement standards revised.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All assessments match the standards. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments-Series II (MCA-II) for general education students and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) for the most significant cognitively disabled students (alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards). Alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards are being considered but timeline for implementation has not yet been determined. All items are created and field tested at least one year before they are operational.

2007-08 Science test operational.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All academic achievement standards will be finalized during standard setting the year the test goes operational. Alternate achievement standards would be finalized in the same years for the respective contents. In 2007-08 Science academic achievement standards will be implemented.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	432206	425180	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8857	8577	96.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	25581	24534	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	38235	36773	96.2
Hispanic	23814	22425	94.2
White, non-Hispanic	335685	332840	99.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	59055	57378	97.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32517	29668	91.2
Economically disadvantaged students	133924	129821	96.9
Migratory students	768	742	96.6
Male	221432	217519	98.2
Female	210773	207661	98.5
Comments: 1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another. 1.2.1 and EDEN N081 ask for the # of students enrolled and the # of students "who participated in assessment." However, CSPR 1.3.1 through 1.3.14 and EDEN N075 & N077 as for # of students "assigned a proficiency level." Those are two different sets, hence the discrepancies.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28901	58.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15869	31.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4975	10.0
Total	49745	
Comments: **There is a discrepancy between the numbers in EDEN file N081 and N075.**		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	432944	427891	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	9140	8885	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	25579	25213	98.6
Black, non-Hispanic	38879	37256	95.8
Hispanic	24324	23607	97.1
White, non-Hispanic	334990	332900	99.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	59662	58239	97.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	33437	31631	94.6
Economically disadvantaged students	136624	133556	97.8
Migratory students	793	770	97.1
Male	222314	219357	98.7
Female	210629	208534	99.0

Comments: **There is a discrepancy between EDEN file N081 and N077**

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another. 1.2.1 and EDEN N081 ask for the # of students enrolled and the # of students "who participated in assessment." However, CSPR 1.3.1 through 1.3.14 and EDEN N075 & N077 as for # of students "assigned a proficiency level." Those are two different sets, hence the discrepancies.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	43334	82.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4097	7.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5095	9.7
Total	52526	
Comments: **There is a discrepancy between the numbers in EDEN File N081 and N077**		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58177	44310	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1260	795	63.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3337	2236	67.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5478	2661	48.6
Hispanic	3693	1829	49.5
White, non-Hispanic	44404	36785	82.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7792	4039	51.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5162	2208	42.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19615	11665	59.5
Migratory students	108	43	39.8
Male	29567	22814	77.2
Female	28610	21496	75.1

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another. 1.2.1 and EDEN N081 ask for the # of students enrolled and the # of students "who participated in assessment." However, CSPR 1.3.1 through 1.3.14 and EDEN N075 & N077 as for # of students "assigned a proficiency level." Those are two different sets, hence the discrepancies.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58534	46405	79.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1264	827	65.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3493	2308	66.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5470	3133	57.3
Hispanic	3848	2190	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	44456	37944	85.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7808	3823	49.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5455	2566	47.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19856	12631	63.6
Migratory students	109	52	47.7
Male	29715	22677	76.3
Female	28819	23728	82.3

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another. 1.2.1 and EDEN N081 ask for the # of students enrolled and the # of students "who participated in assessment." However, CSPR 1.3.1 through 1.3.14 and EDEN N075 & N077 as for # of students "assigned a proficiency level." Those are two different sets, hence the discrepancies.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E,

and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58477	39803	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1245	570	45.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3487	2113	60.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5343	2008	37.6
Hispanic	3658	1582	43.2
White, non-Hispanic	44739	33528	74.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8795	3717	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5036	1818	36.1
Economically disadvantaged students	19320	9442	48.9
Migratory students	139	42	30.2
Male	29985	20368	67.9
Female	28491	19434	68.2

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58664	41845	71.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1247	662	53.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3597	1973	54.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5294	2349	44.4
Hispanic	3774	1630	43.2
White, non-Hispanic	44748	35230	78.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8813	3821	43.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5218	1627	31.2
Economically disadvantaged students	19475	10152	52.1
Migratory students	142	40	28.2
Male	30072	20522	68.2
Female	28591	21323	74.6

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58471	35603	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1213	459	37.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3480	1961	56.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5262	1597	30.3
Hispanic	3359	1186	35.3
White, non-Hispanic	45154	30397	67.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8542	2928	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4535	1321	29.1
Economically disadvantaged students	18876	7666	40.6
Migratory students	130	36	27.7
Male	29864	18158	60.8
Female	28607	17445	61.0

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58686	42878	73.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1220	644	52.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3580	2153	60.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5242	2445	46.6
Hispanic	3463	1636	47.2
White, non-Hispanic	45178	35997	79.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8591	3575	41.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4720	1644	34.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19078	10304	54.0
Migratory students	127	54	42.5
Male	29987	21054	70.2
Female	28699	21824	76.0

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59879	36371	60.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1248	447	35.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3444	1880	54.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5359	1514	28.3
Hispanic	3282	1081	32.9
White, non-Hispanic	46545	31449	67.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8466	2402	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4261	1135	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18838	7362	39.1
Migratory students	105	23	21.9
Male	30702	18562	60.5
Female	29177	17809	61.0

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60097	40071	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1255	574	45.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3544	1893	53.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5333	2151	40.3
Hispanic	3382	1396	41.3
White, non-Hispanic	46582	34057	73.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8501	2802	33.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4423	1284	29.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19024	8925	46.9
Migratory students	105	30	28.6
Male	30815	19409	63.0
Female	29282	20662	70.6

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61863	36710	59.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1296	421	32.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3507	1880	53.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5351	1423	26.6
Hispanic	3164	999	31.6
White, non-Hispanic	48539	31985	65.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8329	2012	24.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3970	974	24.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18928	7006	37.0
Migratory students	100	15	15.0
Male	31749	19109	60.2
Female	30114	17601	58.4
Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.			
1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62004	39258	63.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1295	532	41.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3578	1723	48.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5282	1838	34.8
Hispanic	3264	1200	36.8
White, non-Hispanic	48578	33963	69.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8362	2377	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4084	862	21.1
Economically disadvantaged students	19018	7866	41.4
Migratory students	102	15	14.7
Male	31848	19068	59.9
Female	30156	20190	67.0
Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.			
1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63598	36099	56.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1291	342	26.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3595	1973	54.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5335	1286	24.1
Hispanic	3067	847	27.6
White, non-Hispanic	50305	31651	62.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8226	1634	19.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3879	929	23.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19218	6572	34.2
Migratory students	113	14	12.4
Male	32741	18103	55.3
Female	30857	17996	58.3

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63715	40495	63.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1293	470	36.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3658	1993	54.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5271	1905	36.1
Hispanic	3118	1157	37.1
White, non-Hispanic	50370	34968	69.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8280	2277	27.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3905	1042	26.7
Economically disadvantaged students	19308	8276	42.9
Migratory students	111	18	16.2
Male	32819	19473	59.3
Female	30896	21022	68.0

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64716	20308	31.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1024	112	10.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3684	946	25.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4645	310	6.7
Hispanic	2202	253	11.5
White, non-Hispanic	53154	18687	35.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7228	615	8.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2825	118	4.2
Economically disadvantaged students	15026	1983	13.2
Migratory students	47	<N	
Male	32911	10723	32.6
Female	31805	9585	30.1

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	66192	41107	62.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1311	491	37.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3763	1822	48.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5364	1438	26.8
Hispanic	2758	965	35.0
White, non-Hispanic	52988	36389	68.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7884	1936	24.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3826	730	19.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17797	6964	39.1
Migratory students	74	12	16.2
Male	34101	19866	58.3
Female	32091	21241	66.2

Comments: Changes greater/less than 10% were most likely caused by changing demographics, Minnesota's implementation of new assessments based on more rigorous standards, and improvements to our data collection.

1.3.1 - 1.3.14 and 1.2.1, 1.2.3 use files whose definitions are not consistent with one another.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1911	1187	62.1
Districts	488	257	52.7
Comments: The EdFacts file counts schools and districts that are subject to AYP--total and those making/not making. There are districts and schools in Minnesota not subject to AYP.			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	814	544	66.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	230	108	47.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	584	436	74.7
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
410	218	53.2
Comments: EdFacts file N103 is slated to be resubmitted.		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) has worked diligently in establishing a comprehensive and sustainable state-wide system of support (SSOS) for schools not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Due to the growing number of schools moving into higher levels of consequence MDE has developed and implemented a regional educational service delivery model to provide technical assistance and program support to the schools throughout Minnesota. Using Title IA school improvement funds MDE is able to support the regional service cooperatives to work directly with the schools and/or districts. In addition MDE is able to maintain the oversight that was lacking in our previous plan for SSOS.

The regional model described above also allows the regional service cooperatives to hire AYP Coordinators consisting of distinguished teachers and administrators from their regions to provide leadership and support. With the familiarity of the communities and cultural context of their region and through previously established relationships with regional schools and districts the AYP support teams are able to foster a relationship and begin to deliver the services more quickly and effectively. The regional service cooperatives also prioritize their support for schools according to the levels of AYP consequence. The schools in the deepest level of consequence receive the highest level of support.

MDE maintains oversight of the services provided to schools in multiple ways. Prior to receiving the Title IA school improvement funds each regional service cooperative submitted a grant to MDE clearly stating the plan for working with the schools in their region. Upon approval by MDE the regional service cooperatives began providing the technical assistance to the schools in their region. MDE collects monthly work reports from each of the cooperatives is in weekly contact with AYP Coordinators and has quarterly meetings with all the AYP coordinators across the state.

MDE supports the two largest urban districts with a similar model of support. However MDE does not use the regional service cooperatives to deliver the technical assistance. As with the regional service cooperatives the Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts submit a grant to MDE for the Title IA school improvement funds. The financial support is given directly to the school districts and MDE maintains a more direct relationship with these two districts. This is due to a number of factors. The first is the proximity of the two districts to MDE. Secondly both the Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts have a significant number of structures and internal capacity enabling them to provide their own school improvement support to schools in their district. Given the amount of schools in various levels of consequence of AYP MDE also provides the Minneapolis school district with support in the implementation of key programs such as the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) and the state's Q Comp Program.

The major function of both technical assistance delivery models is to provide support to schools and/or districts in the development and implementation of quality school improvement planning and implementation. In addition to technical assistance offered to schools in AYP through the regional service cooperatives MDE also provided high quality professional development to the schools throughout the state. Topics of this professional development include: leadership professional learning communities data-driven decision making coaching observation and customized workshops per the requests of the schools. Again priority is given to those districts and schools in the deepest levels of AYP consequences.

After the first year of working with identified schools each regional service cooperative AYP Coordinator support team consults with the schools and makes recommendations to the school in updating their school improvement plan. All school improvement plans are then submitted to MDE for approval. Based on the work from the previous year the AYP Coordinators can continue to provide support or they can recommend alternative actions regarding the improvement activities.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	0
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	6
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

In the space below, 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 Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) has worked diligently in establishing a comprehensive and sustainable state-wide system of support (SSOS) for each Local Educational Agency (LEA) not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Due to the growing number of LEAs moving into higher levels of consequence MDE has developed and implemented a regional education service delivery model to provide technical assistance and program support to the LEAs throughout Minnesota. Using Title IA school improvement funds MDE is able to support the regional service cooperatives to work directly with the LEAs. In addition MDE is more able to maintain the oversight that was lacking in our previous plan for our SSOS that relied on external assistance providers who worked directly with the schools in AYP.

The regional model described above also allows the service cooperatives to hire distinguished teachers and administrators from their region to provide leadership and support. With the familiarity of the communities and cultural context of their region and through previously established relationship with schools and districts the AYP Coordinator support teams are able to deliver the services quickly and effectively. The service cooperatives also prioritize their support for LEAs according to the levels of AYP consequence. The districts in the deepest level of consequence receive the highest level of support.

MDE maintains oversight of the services being provided to LEAs in multiple ways. Prior to receiving the Title IA school improvement funds each regional service center submitted a grant to MDE clearly stating the plan working with the LEAs in their region. Upon approval by MDE the regional service cooperatives began providing the technical assistance to the LEAs in their region. MDE collects monthly work reports from each of the cooperatives and has quarterly meetings with all the AYP coordinators from the service cooperatives.

MDE supports the largest urban districts with a similar model of support. However MDE does not use the regional service cooperatives to deliver the technical assistance. Like the regional service cooperatives the Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts submit a grant to MDE for the Title IA school improvement funds. The financial support is given directly to the school districts and MDE maintains a more direct relationship with the districts. This is due to a number of factors. The first is the proximity of the district to MDE. Secondly the Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts have a significant number of structures and internal capacity enabling them to provide school improvement support efforts internally. Given the amount of schools in various levels of consequence of AYP MDE also provides the Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts with support in the implementation of key programs such as the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP).

The major function of both technical assistance delivery models is to provide support to districts on the development and implementation of quality district improvement plans. In addition to technical assistance offered to LEAs in AYP through the regional service cooperatives MDE also provides high quality professional development to the schools throughout the state. Topics of this professional development include: leadership professional learning communities data-driven decision making coaching observation and customized workshops per the requests of the schools. Again priority is given to those districts and schools in deepest levels of AYP consequences.

The main outcome of the work with the LEAs is to increase a district's capacity to assist its schools and student groups not making AYP. If the LEA is not providing the appropriate service to the schools MDE will assist in compliance with applicable state statutes. After the first year of working with identified districts each regional service cooperative AYP Coordinator support team consults with the LEAs and makes recommendations to the district in updating its district improvement plan. All district improvement plans are then submitted to MDE for approval. Based on the work from the previous year AYP Coordinator support teams can continue to provide support or they can recommend alternative actions regarding the improvement activities.

In 2006-2007 there were 35 LEAs identified for not making AYP. Only three of the LEAs moved into the corrective action phase. There were 96 schools and districts combined not making AYP in 2006-2007. All the schools and districts in AYP received technical assistance.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	3
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	2
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
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 SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	08/27/07	08/27/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	07/27/07	07/27/07
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	33	3
Schools	87	1
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	01/15/08
---	----------

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) changed the approach to state-wide system of support (SSOS) in the 2006-07 school year. Prior to this schools and/or districts were able to generate contracts with external assistance providers to support their school and/or district improvement efforts. After a comprehensive evaluation entailing interviews with key district personnel and with principals from schools not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) it was determined that the system was lacking an intentional relationship between the State Educational Agency (SEA) and the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to support system-wide capacity building. Similarly there was a breakdown in school to district coherence. In addition a consistent model of support was not provided since the external assistance providers differed in their approach.

To address these difficulties MDE has worked diligently in establishing a comprehensive and sustainable SSOS for LEAs and schools not making AYP. MDE reviewed model states and convened a key stakeholder task force to create a new model of SSOS. Due to the growing number of LEAs moving into higher levels of consequence MDE with this task force developed and implemented a regional education service delivery model to provide technical assistance and program support to the LEAs throughout Minnesota. Using Title IA Section 1003(a) school improvement funds MDE is able to support the regional service cooperatives to work directly with the LEAs. In addition MDE and the districts are better able to maintain the oversight that was lacking in our previous plan for our SSOS.

The regional model described above also allows the service cooperatives to hire distinguished teachers and administrators from their region to provide leadership and support. With the familiarity of the communities and cultural context of their region and through previously established relationships with regional schools and districts the AYP support teams are able to foster a relationship and begin to deliver the services more quickly and effectively. The service cooperatives also prioritize their support for schools according to the levels of AYP consequence. The schools in the deepest level of consequence receive the highest level of support.

MDE maintains oversight of the services provided to LEAs in multiple ways. Prior to receiving the Title IA school improvement funds each regional service cooperative submitted a grant to MDE clearly stating the plan for working with the LEAs in their region. Upon approval by MDE the regional service cooperatives began providing technical assistance to the LEAs in their region. MDE collects monthly work reports from each of the service cooperatives and holds quarterly meetings with AYP Coordinators from all eight service cooperatives in the state.

MDE supports the largest urban districts with a similar model of support. However MDE does not use the regional service cooperatives to deliver the technical assistance. Like the regional service cooperatives the Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts submit a grant to MDE for the Title IA school improvement funds. The financial support is given directly to these school districts and MDE maintains a more direct relationship with the district. This is due to a number of factors. The first is the proximity of the districts to MDE. Secondly the Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts have a significant number of structures and internal capacity in place to provide support to their schools in their district. Given the amount of schools in various levels of consequence of AYP MDE also provides the Minneapolis school district with support in the implementation of key programs such as the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP).

The major function of both technical assistance delivery models is to provide support to districts on the development and implementation of quality district improvement plans. In addition to the technical assistance offered to LEAs in AYP through the regional service cooperatives MDE also provided high quality professional development to the schools throughout the state. Topics of this professional development include: leadership professional learning communities data-driven decision making coaching observation and customized workshops per the requests of the schools. Again priority is given to those districts and schools in various levels of AYP consequences.

The main outcome of the work with the LEAs is to increase the district's capacity to support the schools in their districts. The LEA is responsible for assisting their schools and student groups not making AYP. If the LEA is not providing the appropriate service to the schools MDE will assist in compliance with applicable state statutes. After the first year of working with identified schools the AYP Coordinator support teams established at the regional service cooperatives consult with the LEAs and make recommendations to the school and district in updating their school improvement plan. All school improvement plans are then submitted to MDE for approval. Based on the work from the previous year AYP Coordinators can continue to provide support or they can recommend alternative actions regarding the improvement activities.

In 2006-07 there were 35 LEAs identified for not making AYP. Only three of the LEAs were in the corrective action phase. There

were 96 schools and districts combined not making AYP in 2006-2007. All the schools and districts in AYP received technical assistance.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	17
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	15
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	49364
Who applied to transfer	207
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	99

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>No</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments: EDEN file N010 includes all students who transferred. We are unable from the data available at the LEA level, distinguish those who transfer under Title I public school choice provisions from those who transfer under Minnesota's open enrollment legislation.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 82608
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	
Comments: Sorry we didn't collect this data.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	50
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	19041
Who applied for supplemental educational services	4361
Who received supplemental educational services	3150
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3286201
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	92632	90524	97.7	2108	2.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	8736	8513	97.4	223	2.6
Low-poverty schools	8401	8248	98.2	153	1.8
All elementary schools	32486	31892	98.2	594	1.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	8853	8329	94.1	524	5.9
Low-poverty schools	20952	20623	98.4	329	1.6
All secondary schools	60146	58632	97.5	1514	2.5
Comments:					

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:

--

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.

Because of the way data are collected, Minnesota uses a hybrid method. Since we have no classroom level student data, we must use teacher data and the teacher data are collected in the form of assignments, which can cover more than one class, but not more than one subject. For example, a teacher may teach two classes of Algebra I and have one assignment for Algebra I. Alternately, the same teacher could instead be reported with a separate assignment for each "section" of Algebra I taught.

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	23.7
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	39.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	37.2
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	9.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	39.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	50.9
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	50.7	21.6
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch	
Secondary schools	52.4	20.1
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- # Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
- Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
- % Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
- OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
2	Dual language	Spanish, French	25.0	75.0
5	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Hmong, Somali	25.0	75.0
4	Transitional bilingual	Spanish, Hmong, Somali	25.0	75.0
2	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Hmong	30.0	70.0
0	Heritage language			
38	Sheltered English instruction			
50	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
78	Content-based ESL			
71	Pull-out ESL			
65	Other (explain)			
Comments: Other:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	61083
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	27398
Hmong	18355
Somali	9508
Vietnamese	1923
Russian	1449

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Cambodian/Khmer 1,118 Creolized English 1,094 Lao 1,042
--

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	57520
Not tested/State annual ELP	6718
Subtotal	64238
LEP/One Data Point	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	54976
Not tested/State annual ELP	6107
Subtotal	61083
LEP/One Data Point	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress		37374	58.2	
No progress		26864		
ELP attainment		2989	4.7	
Comments: Minnesota has 3 cohorts based on years in schools. Each of the 3 cohorts has its own target.				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: Not required because 1.6.3.2.1 row 2 is YES				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	12764
MFLEP/AYP grades	12764
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	21798
LEP HS/Non-AYP	9236
LEP other grades	2191
Comments: Other grades: Early Childhood = 735; PreSchool = 1002	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
7200	5564	12764
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6194	3013	48.6	3181

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6384	3660	57.3	2724

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	88
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	31
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	37
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	14
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	19
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	14
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	7
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	5
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	6
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	13
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	21
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	6
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
18158	5667	3

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>No</u>	Multi-year	<u>Yes</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments: The award is a two-year cycle based on 10% increase of immigrants over the previous 2 years and a minimum of 250 immigrants enrolled in the district.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1253
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	650
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	561

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

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	76	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	66	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	53	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	55	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	56	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	69	5177
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	80	1550
PD provided to principals	50	450
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	44	346
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	19	1694
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	15	398
Total		9615
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/06	07/01/06	37
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Minnesota has worked hard to shorten the distribution time span. The ESEA Consolidated Applications were due end of June and some applications were reviewed and approved as soon as possible and funds were made available immediately. By September 14 all districts had access to the funds.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	65.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	71.2
Hispanic	65.1
White, non-Hispanic	93.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	82.6
Limited English proficient	62.8
Economically disadvantaged	80.7
Migratory students	53.4
Male	88.9
Female	92.5
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	9.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	34.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	10.0
Black, non-Hispanic	28.3
Hispanic	34.9
White, non-Hispanic	6.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19.3
Limited English proficient	28.5
Economically disadvantaged	19.2
Migratory students	46.6
Male	11.0
Female	7.5
Comments: Dropout Rate presented here is the NCLB-AYP rate (Measure 2) for 2005-2006, as published in the MN Report Card, Statewide	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	480	480
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	488	488
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)	10	350
K	85	406
1	113	392
2	119	346
3	120	310
4	114	309
5	101	281
6	95	293
7	95	285
8	96	300
9	128	316
10	103	353
11	99	299
12	114	376
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1392	4616
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	608	3818
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	640	654
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	30	10
Hotels/Motels	114	134
Total	1392	4616
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1376
K	598
1	635
2	547
3	518
4	505
5	465
6	519
7	481
8	563
9	584
10	702
11	576
12	778
Ungraded	330
Total	9177
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	193
Migratory children/youth	46
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1973
Limit English proficient students	766
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	8
2. Expedited evaluations	5
3. Staff professional development and awareness	7
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
5. Transportation	7
6. Early childhood programs	7
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	6
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	7
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	8
12. Counseling	6
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
15. School supplies	7
16. Referral to other programs and services	6
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	4
2. School Selection	2
3. Transportation	5
4. School records	4
5. Immunizations	4
6. Other medical records	4
7. Other Barriers	4
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	209	86
4	206	69
5	181	68
6	191	55
7	170	41
8	174	42
High School	165	33

Comments: This year, all Homeless Student Assessment data were derived from our primary student and assessment data systems and populated the CSPR directly from EDEN file N077, rather than from direct self-reporting by McKinney-Vento subgrantees as was done last year.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	209	65
4	211	39
5	184	40
6	191	31
7	176	27
8	174	27
High School	120	5

Comments: This year, all Homeless Student Assessment data were derived from our primary student and assessment data systems and populated the CSPR directly from EDEN file N075, rather than from direct self-reporting by McKinney-Vento subgrantees as was done last year.

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	634
K	266
1	271
2	257
3	241
4	223
5	230
6	190
7	174
8	189
9	191
10	209
11	114
12	102
Ungraded	53
Out-of-school	38
Total	3382
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Explanation of Significant Differences in Child Counts

Explain any significant changes from last year in the number of students reported this year for both categories 1 and 2.

2006 2007 Change in #

(9/01/05-8/31/06) (9/01/06-8/31/07)

12 month 3991 3382 < 609

Summer 2342 1499 < 843

Our summer numbers decreased because we were able to fully fund just 7 summer projects instead of our usual 15. Three other summer projects were given very limited funding. This was due to a one third cut in our migrant funds.

Increased communication and oversight between school year districts, TVOC and MMERC during the school year increased the school year count by 217 students.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	408
K	100
1	131
2	98
3	101
4	97
5	95
6	80
7	61
8	79
9	66
10	79
11	46
12	30
Ungraded	21
Out-of-school	<N
Total	
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Explanation of Significant Differences in Child Counts

Explain any significant changes from last year in the number of students reported this year for both categories 1 and 2.

2006 2007 Change in #

(9/01/05-8/31/06) (9/01/06-8/31/07)

12 month 3991 3382 < 609

Summer 2342 1499 < 843

Our summer numbers decreased because we were able to fully fund just 7 summer projects instead of our usual 15. Three other summer projects were given very limited funding. This was due to a one third cut in our migrant funds.

Increased communication and oversight between school year districts, TVOC and MMERC during the school year increased the school year count by 217 students.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

<p>a. Student information system(s).</p> <p>i. What system(s) did your state use to compile and generate its 2004-05 category 1 child count and the category 2 child count?</p> <p>In January 2000 MN began and continues to use the MIS2000 system.</p> <p>ii. Were last year's child counts generated using the same system(s)?</p> <p>Yes, MN has used MIS2000 system to generate 2005-06 and 2006-07 child count.</p> <p>iii. Will the state be using the same system(s) to generate the 2007-2008 child count?</p> <p>Yes, MN is renewing the contract and will be using the same MIS2000 system to generate the 2007-2008.</p>
--

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

i. How were the child count data collected? Please describe, in narrative form, (a) what data were collected, (b) what activities were conducted to collect the data, and (c) when were the data collected for use in the student information system.

MN Identification & Recruitment process is to work cooperatively with Tri-Valley Opportunity Council (TVOC) to recruit potential eligible migrant children ages 6 weeks to age 21 with oversight by Midwest Migrant Educational Resource Center (MMERC). This joint recruitment process allows TVOC, a Head Start program serving children ages 6 weeks to 5 years old or until they enter kindergarten and the Title I Migrant Education Program to directly serve students PreK-21.

(a) The following COE data elements we collect are: student information (family surnames): birth date, age, gender, race, parent or guardian(s) legal names, unique student identification number (MARSS), current residence, home base residence, all children's names, relationship to parent or guardian, current grade and school, qualifying activity, qualifying activity date and resident date.

(b) The local and regional outreach workers conduct personal interviews in the following locations: homes, schools, businesses, labor camps, processing plants, in the fields and farms with potential eligible migrant families to determine eligibility using an original, triplicate paper copy of the Certificate of Eligibility. Once eligibility is determined the parent/guardian and the recruiter signs for eligibility verification.

School Year Process - The Family Service Worker (FSW)/Local Recruiter gathers information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. We also had 4 regional recruiters that identified migrant students in unfunded districts and did outreach to agriculture businesses. The information is reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to Judy Meyer our Quality control specialist at Tri-Valley and then forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputs the data into the MIS2000 system. The data entry clerk forwards reports to Kathleen Bibus, MMERC Director, who reviews them for accuracy.

Summer Process - The Regional Statewide Recruiter (Family Service Worker (FSW)/Local Recruiter) gathers information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. The information is reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to Judy Meyer our Quality control specialist at Tri-Valley and then forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputs the data into the MIS2000 system. The data entry clerk forwards reports to Kathleen Bibus, MMERC Director, who reviews them for accuracy.

(c) The data is collected continuously and submitted regularly and entered into the MIS2000 database.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

In order to verify the count and before any of the tables are run, our MIS2000 data entry clerk runs a snap report that is in the MIS2000 database system called "Potential Duplicate Students". A list is generated that identifies all students that have the same first and last name and same date of birth. The students are merged in the system to eliminate any duplication. A second report is run from the Potential Duplicate Students, but using different criteria. A request is made for the same first name OR last name AND same date of birth. This list is much larger. It is checked for any possible misspellings or obvious errors and we verify the COE to see if the students have the same family surname. Sometimes it is discovered that there are two COES for the same family. At that point, the quality control process requires that the data be reviewed by 2 individuals: Judy Meyer from TVOC and Kathy Bilbus from the Midwest Resource Center. If necessary the recruiter will also be involved and the duplication addressed.

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.

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:

1. students who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were between 3-21 years -of-age, were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
2. students who were resident in your state for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/1-8/31);
3. students who- in the case of category 2- received an MEP funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
4. students once per child count category.

- EnrollDate, FundingDate, QADate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between the StartDate and the EndDate entered (Check for dates of activity that occur during the date range.)

- FacilityID is between MN and MO (Count only enrollments in MN schools.)

- Birthdate is after the StartDate minus 22 years (The child turns 22 after the StartDate.)

- Birthdate is before the EndDate minus 3 years (The child turns 3 before the EndDate.)

- 22nd Birthday is after the FundingDate (The child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)

- 3rd Birthday is before the WithdrawDate, or the WithdrawDate is null (The child turns 3 before the WithdrawDate or there is no WithdrawDate entered.)

- LQMDate plus 3 years is after the StartDate (LQMDate is within 3 years of the StartDate.)

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

i. 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:

1. students who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were between 3-21 years -of-age, were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
 2. students who were resident in your state for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/1-8/31);
 3. students who- in the case of category 2- received an MEP funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
 4. students once per child count category.
- EnrollDate, FundingDate, QADate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between the StartDate and the EndDate entered (Check for dates of activity that occur during the date range.)
 - FacilityID is between MN and MO (Count only enrollments in MN schools.)
 - Birthdate is after the StartDate minus 22 years (The child turns 22 after the StartDate.)
 - Birthdate is before the EndDate minus 3 years (The child turns 3 before the EndDate.)
 - 22nd Birthday is after the FundingDate (The child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)
 - 3rd Birthday is before the WithdrawDate, or the WithdrawDate is null (The child turns 3 before the WithdrawDate or there is no WithdrawDate entered.)
 - LQMDate plus 3 years is after the StartDate (LQMDate is within 3 years of the StartDate.)

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.

i. 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:

1. students who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were between 3-21 years -of-age, were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
 2. students who were resident in your state for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/1-8/31);
 3. students who- in the case of category 2- received an MEP funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
 4. students once per child count category.
- EnrollDate, FundingDate, QADate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between the StartDate and the EndDate entered (Check for

dates of activity that occur during the date range.)

- FacilityID is between MN and MO (Count only enrollments in MN schools.)
- Birthdate is after the StartDate minus 22 years (The child turns 22 after the StartDate.)
- Birthdate is before the EndDate minus 3 years (The child turns 3 before the EndDate.)
- 22nd Birthday is after the FundingDate (The child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)
- 3rd Birthday is before the WithdrawDate, or the WithdrawDate is null (The child turns 3 before the WithdrawDate or there is no WithdrawDate entered.)
- LQMDate plus 3 years is after the StartDate (LQMDate is within 3 years of the StartDate.)

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1. The Recruiter conducts a personal interview to gather migrant eligibility information on the COE, once eligibility is determined and certification is completed then both the parent and the recruiter verify the data by signing the hard copy, triplicate COE.
2. The District Migrant Contact /Program Supervisor reviews the COE to be certain the form is complete and signs off. If additional information is needed the District Migrant Contact person notifies the original recruiter to gather the missing information.
3. The COEs are sent to Judy Meyer our ID&R specialist at Tri-Valley and then forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputs the data into the MIS2000 system.
4. Upon receipt of the COE, the Data Entry clerk verifies and enters the information into the MIS2000 system.
5. The Data Entry clerk sends a report of identified students, summer and school year to Kathleen Bibus to check for accuracy and quality control.
6. State receives entered COE on a monthly basis and then files the original hard copies. The SEA migrant unit runs snap reports on an as needed basis. All original COE are on file for six years at the State office.

Box 1 additional responses requested.

Please explain in further detail what steps Minnesota takes to train its recruiters. Topics may include the following:

If Minnesota uses a standard COE statewide; if/how Minnesota and/or regional offices train recruiters (and how often) and what is covered in the trainings:

Minnesota uses a standard COE that was collaboratively designed with Tri-Valley Opportunity Council, Inc. (TVOC), our Headstart counterpart.

If/how Minnesota provides recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook):

Minnesota is currently working on a handbook. We wanted to be able to coordinate with the new national handbook designed by MERC, but as that has not been disseminated yet, we have gone ahead with key chapters and handouts. We have a chapter on eligibility issues and procedures and handouts on many issues such as procedures for district visits and re-interviewing procedures. All recruiters also have a copy of the October 2003 NRG. We provide extensive regional trainings on a monthly basis except during January and February and have weekly conference calls with all regional recruiters.

If/how Minnesota periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises procedures:

We give pre and post tests and evaluations at every training and recruiters always have the opportunity to discuss issues and problem solve for solutions. We send bi-monthly status reports to all recruiters, TVOC, Midwest Migrant Resource Center (MMERC), and our state director that show what districts have been contacted and number of students identified at each district. In our weekly conference calls, these are discussed and if there are any difficulties with district visits or other issues, solutions are worked out. We re-interview 5% of our currently identified migrants on a quarterly basis to ensure current identification procedures.

If/how written procedures are provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data:

Every spring the Minnesota Department of Education, Migrant Education Program in collaboration with TVOC and the Midwest Migrant Education Resource Center (MMERC) conduct trainings for all funded MEP sites. We have breakout sessions specifically for recruiters and school personnel in how to complete enrollment and withdrawal forms, each site collects attendance data and submits it to MDE at the end of the summer session.

If/how records/data entry personnel are provided training at least annually on how to review summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes.

MDE contract with TVOC to do the data entry, prior to data being entered into the MIS2000 database, the TVOC ID&R manager reviews each COE and contacts the recruiter if there is a discrepancy or error.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We randomly selected 85 families for re-interviews from districts with previous reporting problems and other districts. Out of the 85 families we attempted to contact 38 were able to be reinterviewed. (47 families could not be contacted.) Out of the 38 families there were 4 families that were, upon further review, removed from the system.

The biggest issue was finding folks, most had moved out of state. Some families were contacted via phone in their home base (mainly Texas).

Box 2 additional information requested.

Please provide further detail regarding Minnesota's re-interview process. Information includes the following:

Was there a standard instrument used?

Yes, Minnesota created an instrument to be used during the re-interviewing process.

Was there a protocol that contains all items used in making the original eligibility determination?

Minnesota included all the original eligibility determination questions in the re-interview instrument that was created.

Were re-interviewers trained and provided guidance?

Yes, Minnesota Department of Education, Migrant Education Program provided training for Hispanic Advocacy and Community Empowerment through Research (HACER). The definition and purpose of the MEP was covered thoroughly. We also distributed a copy of the NRG of October 2003 to be used as a reference for clarifying any questions.

Were re-interviewers independent from original interviews?

Yes, HACER is a 3rd party contractor. They have no affiliation with the original interviewers.

Also, address the fact that the sample size only consisted of 38 families—it should consist of at least 50. The re-interview response rate must exceed 75 percent of those sampled, but Minnesota's response rate was below 50 percent.

The sample size comprised a total of 722 randomly selected students who had previously been determined eligible for MEP services. Selection was stratified and weighted by qualifying arrive date (QAD) and region. HACER performed due diligence to re-interview all students and/or their parent in person. Two staff members, one of whom was not primarily involved in conducting re-interviews, led the eligibility determination process. These individual independently reviewed each re-interview form and determined eligibility based on what information appeared on them. This process took place before MDE's electronic COE had been matched to the re-interview forms. Once both persons finalized determining eligibility for all 381 re-interview, staff compared their determinations, discussed discrepancies and agreed to a final determination.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

We run a built-in snap report in the MIS2000 database system called Potential Duplicate Students. It is used to merge duplicate students (same last and first name and same date of birth). Then a second report, which uses broader criteria, (same last OR first name AND same date of birth) is run. We review the electronic COE to determine if the family is the same and notify the local migrant education specialist to verify the paper COE.

An additional report, "Verifying COE Data" in the MIS2000 system is used by the data entry clerk. The clerk will use this report to crosscheck the report and the COEs to ensure the required data was entered accurately in the system. The data entry clerk sends the batch of COEs along with the report to the State Migrant Education Specialist who then files it. This is an on-going process.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 final steps taken by SEA staff to verify the child counts produced by our MIS2000 system in category 1 and category 2 prior to submission to ED is running additional reports, "Verifying COE Data" in the MIS2000 system is used by the data entry clerk. The clerk will use this report to crosscheck the report and the COEs to ensure the required data was entered accurately in the system. They send the batch of COEs along with the report to the State Migrant Education Specialist who then files the original COEs. This is an on-going process.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

MDE contracted the identification and recruitment oversight process with MMERC (Midwest Migrant Education Resource Center).

AMMERC reviews the eligible status of students on a bi-weekly basis and discrepancies are addressed.

This review takes place between MDE, MMERC and the Tri-Valley Opportunity Council (the contractor that does the data entry).

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.