

**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

VERMONT



**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: Vermont Department of Education	
Address: 120 State Street Montpelier, VT	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Kerry Garber	
Telephone: 802-828-3150	
Fax: 802-828-0573	
e-mail: kerry.garber@state.vt.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Kerry Garber	
_____ Signature	<u>Friday, March 7, 2008, 5:14:49 PM</u> Date

**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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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.

The only revisions or changes planned are to the alternate assessment for students with the most significant disabilities. We are currently in the process of developing our plan and timeline for approval by US DOE.
--

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.

No revisions or changes planned except for the alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities described in the previous question.

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.

The first operational administration of the NECAP Science assessment at grades 4, 8 and 11 will occur in May 2008.

The Science assessment for students with the most significant disabilities will be addressed as part of the revision work for the alternate assessment to include science. This work is planned to take 2 years under a Compliance Agreement with the US DOE.

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.

As stated earlier, first operational test in May 2008, standards will be set in August 2008 and results will be available in the fall.

For the science component of the alternate assessment, this will be included in the workplan and timeline.

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	41560	40922	98.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	285	285	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	706	706	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	662	661	99.8
Hispanic	387	386	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	35574	35515	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5261	5223	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	950	947	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	12739	12700	99.7
Migratory students	128	128	100.0
Male	21101	21049	99.8
Female	19899	19873	99.9
Comments: The state of Vermont has made an concerted effort in the past year to improve the participation of Migratory Students in assessment.			

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	1605	30.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3269	62.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	349	6.7
Total	5223	
Comments:		

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	41560	40877	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	286	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	705	705	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	661	660	99.8
Hispanic	386	385	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	35562	35508	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5254	5215	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	923	920	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	12707	12670	99.7
Migratory students	128	128	100.0
Male	21070	21023	99.8
Female	19878	19854	99.9
Comments:			

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	1711	32.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3152	60.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	352	6.7
Total	5215	
Comments:		

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	6498	4378	67.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	23	47.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	131	83	63.4
Black, non-Hispanic	132	48	36.4
Hispanic	71	43	60.6
White, non-Hispanic	6104	4174	68.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	606	201	33.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	174	97	55.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2148	1128	52.5
Migratory students	27	13	48.1
Male	3314	2256	68.1
Female	3184	2122	66.6
Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.			
IEP testing no longer includes out-of-level testing as participants.			

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.

1.3.2 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	6492	4601	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	27	56.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	131	109	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	130	64	49.2
Hispanic	71	46	64.8
White, non-Hispanic	6100	4345	71.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	606	169	27.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	171	107	62.6
Economically disadvantaged students	2144	1183	55.2
Migratory students	27	14	51.9
Male	3312	2179	65.8
Female	3180	2422	76.2
Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.			
IEP testing no longer includes out-of-level testing as participants.			

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.

1.3.3 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	6548	4168	63.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	19	37.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	129	98	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	144	55	38.2
Hispanic	76	39	51.3
White, non-Hispanic	6139	3951	64.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	801	225	28.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	174	88	50.6
Economically disadvantaged students	2123	983	46.3
Migratory students	34	15	44.1
Male	3397	2181	64.2
Female	3151	1987	63.1
Comments: Male and Female counts were reported incorrectly on CSPR 2006. Should be Female 3171, 62.06% proficient and Male 3404, 63.19% proficient.			
LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.			
Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.			

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	6534	4447	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	28	54.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	127	99	78.0
Black, non-Hispanic	140	83	59.3
Hispanic	75	45	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	6132	4186	68.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	797	198	24.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	167	97	58.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2114	1099	52.0
Migratory students	34	19	55.9
Male	3386	2131	62.9
Female	3148	2316	73.6
Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.			
Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.			

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	6575	4275	65.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	19	39.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	128	102	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	135	65	48.1
Hispanic	72	39	54.2
White, non-Hispanic	6187	4049	65.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	867	204	23.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	163	83	50.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2146	1030	48.0
Migratory students	30	<N	
Male	3380	2189	64.8
Female	3195	2086	65.3

Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.

Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.

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.

1.3.6 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	6565	4586	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	30	62.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	128	104	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	131	78	59.5
Hispanic	71	45	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	6182	4326	70.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	860	193	22.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	158	89	56.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2138	1157	54.1
Migratory students	30	16	53.3
Male	3372	2270	67.3
Female	3193	2316	72.5

Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.

Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.

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.

1.3.7 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	6875	4418	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	18	42.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	110	82	74.5
Black, non-Hispanic	150	55	36.7
Hispanic	63	31	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	6496	4225	65.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	926	182	19.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	155	74	47.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2136	965	45.2
Migratory students	28	<N	
Male	3515	2269	64.6
Female	3360	2149	64.0

Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.

Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.

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.

1.3.8 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	6863	4744	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	25	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	83	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	149	76	51.0
Hispanic	62	33	53.2
White, non-Hispanic	6488	4518	69.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	922	200	21.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	150	74	49.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2128	1096	51.5
Migratory students	27	<N	
Male	3508	2302	65.6
Female	3355	2442	72.8

Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.

Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.

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.

1.3.9 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	7172	4521	63.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	67	25	37.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	134	89	66.4
Black, non-Hispanic	109	49	45.0
Hispanic	81	46	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	6762	4302	63.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	969	206	21.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	138	68	49.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2142	935	43.7
Migratory students	18	<N	
Male	3676	2257	61.4
Female	3496	2264	64.8
Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.			
Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.			

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.

1.3.10 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	7176	4806	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	68	36	52.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	133	97	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	104	50	48.1
Hispanic	80	55	68.8
White, non-Hispanic	6772	4557	67.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	979	218	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	134	76	56.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2149	1018	47.4
Migratory students	18	<N	
Male	3679	2302	62.6
Female	3497	2504	71.6
Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.			
Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.			

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.

1.3.11 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	7254	4315	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	16	32.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	136	95	69.9
Black, non-Hispanic	123	51	41.5
Hispanic	94	50	53.2
White, non-Hispanic	6823	4092	60.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1054	161	15.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	152	76	50.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2005	811	40.4
Migratory students	20	<N	
Male	3767	2168	57.6
Female	3487	2147	61.6

Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.

Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.

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.

1.3.12 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	7247	4733	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	22	44.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	135	97	71.9
Black, non-Hispanic	122	67	54.9
Hispanic	93	51	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	6820	4478	65.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1051	178	16.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	146	84	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	1997	934	46.8
Migratory students	20	<N	
Male	3766	2200	58.4
Female	3481	2533	72.8

Comments: LEP has been our fastest growing demographic group.

Other groups have small numbers which make 10% changes more likely.

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.

1.3.13 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: No testing in High School during the 2006-2007 school year in Vermont			

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.

1.3.14 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: No testing in High School during the 2006-2007 school year in Vermont			

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.

1.4 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	313	275	87.9
Districts	239	198	82.8
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. 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	217	189	87.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	130	113	86.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	87	76	87.4
Comments: Academic Indicator Decision for High Schools may have changed the rigor of AYP for those schools			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. 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
208	161	77.4
Comments: Academic Indicator Decision for High Schools may have changed the rigor of AYP for those districts		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* 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 State Board of Education in Vermont has very recently initiated a statewide conversation about the transformation of Vermont's education system for the 21st century. The State Board has identified five components for the desired state of the transformed system:

- o Student-centered Education
- o Leadership in a Student-centered Learning Environment
- o Flexible Learning Environments
- o Engaged Community Partners
- o Results and Indicators of Success

Vermont's Statewide System of Support will certainly change as a result of statewide focus on these goals over the next several years. Since 2006, a cross-department team under the leadership of the Standards and Assessment Division has been building a framework for a Comprehensive Local Assessment System to address curriculum, instruction and assessment. We have brought together people representing multiple initiatives (i.e. Formative Assessment Project, RTI, Career and Technical Education, Progress Monitoring, Creating Responsive Schools, Positive Behavior Intervention Systems, etc.) to develop core principles and rubrics to help schools to develop local systems that have shared expectations for student learning and use student data to inform instructional practice. The rubrics consider six elements of practice: system of collaboration, leadership, curriculum, assessments, evidence of learning and professional development.

Beginning with SY2007-2008, Vermont made a significant change in the focus of the Commissioner's Required Actions (CRA), the vehicle through which the Commissioner describes in writing the actions an identified school must take. These actions are required by state law and are aligned, as necessary, with the Title I requirements for identified schools. In the past, the CRA focused solely on describing "inputs", requiring schools to agree to specific professional development activities or interventions for students. Those actions can still be found in the CRA and more often in the school's action/improvement plans and are supported by Title I pass through funds; however, the CRA now requires all schools beginning in Year One school improvement to:

- o Identify curriculum measures that the school will use to track student progress for, at a minimum, those groups and content areas for which the school is identified.
- o Develop a continuum of support for student learning, identifying the specific student supports and a system by which principals can monitor necessary aspects including teacher referral, student attendance and parental outreach.
- o Collect and report data to local community and to the Commissioner on a regular basis.
- o Ensure principal participation in a Principal Learning Community that will focus on the implementation of the CRA, methods of addressing achievement gaps and implementation of federal requirements, such as Supplemental Educational Services.

This refocusing of the CRA occurred because one of the characteristics of effective schools is the frequent monitoring of student progress through a variety of assessments. This requirement aligns well with the stated measurable outcome in the application for the use of the new 1003 (g) School Improvement Funds that "LEAs and schools make decisions about the use of these funds based on data and create systems of continuous feedback and improvement." This was one of the goals of including progress monitoring in the CRA. The 1003 (a) funds are used to support the strategies and needs that are identified from the progress monitoring.

We have started all schools identified for the first time for SY2007-2008 on this new set of CRA to support their acquiring additional data from progress monitoring to better target instruction and determine more specific classroom interventions for those students not making adequate progress. The data will also ensure that their school's comprehensive system of support addresses the range of need indicated by their student population. One goal is that over several years of progress monitoring, schools will have the data to focus on the most significant level of intervention necessary to address those students with the greatest needs. They will have ensured the best first teaching and the best general classroom and school wide supports. If the school continues to be identified,

they should, at least, be able to demonstrate how restructuring efforts should be targeted to address the needs of a more limited group of students.

Schools that were already in the school improvement system have also been transitioned to include progress monitoring in their CRA.

Over the last two years, Vermont's system of support has also moved to include a strong focus on formative assessment as illustrated by an ongoing initiative to implement ETS' Keeping Learning on Track (KLT) throughout the state. We began in the summer of 2006 with nine pilot schools, most of which were identified schools. These schools formed Teacher Learning Communities (TLC) that meet throughout the school year to support participating teachers' implementation of formative assessment strategies in their classrooms.

An external coach and on-line networking for the coaches were provided during the pilot year. In spring 2007, ETS trained Vermont DOE staff and the original external coaches to become KLT trainers. During the summer of 2007, the Vermont DOE worked with our regional Educational Service Agencies (ESA) to provide initial KLT training to 30 TLC leaders and approximately the same number of new school/district teams. Our intent is to grow this effort across schools and within schools in partnership with ESAs and local districts. Identified schools are now strongly encouraged to participate in this initiative.

In addition, we have recently posted an RFP for new proposals under the Math Science Partnership grants that would focus on 7-12 schools and would combine the formative assessment as demonstrated by KLT program with the required focus on content in either math or science.

Additionally, we have worked with the CCSSO to align the Survey of Enacted Curriculum with Vermont's grade expectations and consider this another important available tool for identified schools. Individual identified schools also participate in model comprehensive programs supported by the Department and key partners, for example, Teaching All Secondary Students (TASS) and Creating Responsive Schools (CRS).

Vermont is also currently engaged in a major effort to revise our Comprehensive Educational Support System, based on Adelman and Taylor's national model, New Directions for Student Support. The planning team for this statewide initiative includes members from the DOE, from local schools and districts and from other state agencies that provide critical services to students, schools and families. Vermont is also providing support to schools implementing Responsiveness to Instruction (RTI), Differentiated Instruction (DI) and Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS), all efforts that strengthen the core academic and behavioral programs in schools. These are all opportunities that we prioritize and support our identified schools to participate in. We are currently engaged in aligning these strategic supports under a common framework.

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	0
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	2
Comments: This data reflects the level of consequences for schools during SY 2006-2007. Test results used in the AYP decision reflected student achievement in SY05-06.	

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.

School Support Coordinators work with districts to assure that they have a district wide improvement plan that coordinates with the improvement plans of schools in the district. Coordinators also assist the district to find other resources to support district plan, as necessary.

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the 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	04/06/07	04/06/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		
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	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: There are multiple opportunities for schools and districts to verify data and for the correction of inaccurate data. Our level of communication and interaction with schools has resulted in no history of appeals in Vermont.		

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	
---	--

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.

Description of the Allocation Process for School Improvement Funds

Under Vermont law, the Commissioner of Education describes in writing actions that identified for improvement must take to meet student performance standards. For Title I schools, those actions are aligned with the requirements of Section 1116 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

School Support Coordinators work with school and district leadership to develop recommended required actions which the Commissioner reviews, modifies as necessary, and approves. These actions are designed to enable the schools to meet the progress goals in their action/improvement plans and are targeted to address the content areas and student populations not making AYP in the school.

While required actions are being developed, the Department determines how funds are allocated to each identified Title I school.

The allocation includes two parts, poverty and concentration. Poverty is based on the number of Free and Reduced Lunch and Milk (FRLM) students at the school. Concentration is based on the percentage of students enrolled in FRLM. The total pass-through amount is based on poverty and 25% on concentration.

In addition, the 'AYP Criteria Weight' is calculated for each school. This is the total number of AYP elements for which the school has not made AYP (up to three—Reading index, Math index, and Academic Indicator), divided by the total number of AYP elements marked for all schools in the allocation.

In this manner, the allocation ensures that those schools that are relatively poor and have relatively high concentrations of students receiving FRLM and/or have the lowest-achievement because they are not making AYP in multiple areas, receive an allocation that accounts for those factors.

School Support Coordinators inform schools and districts of the allocation amount for each school as they are developing the required actions. As part of that discussion, plans are made for technical assistance from district, state and external providers. Once the required actions are completed, schools submit a grant request for their pass-through allocation, which focuses on the required actions. Grants are then approved and funds sent to the district to support the specific activities necessary to improve student achievement in the identified Title I schools.

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

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

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	2
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	2
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	694
Who applied to transfer	<N
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	<N

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	Yes <u> </u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No Response <u> </u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response <u> </u>
Comments:	

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	\$ 0
Comments: The Vermont Department of Education does not collect the transportation dollars spent on school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA	

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	14
Comments: All of these LEAs have only one school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice	

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	5
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	3954
Who applied for supplemental educational services	143
Who received supplemental educational services	136
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	\$ 0
Comments: Vermont Department of Education does not collect dollar amounts spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA	

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	20002	18567	92.8	1435	7.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1592	1464	92.0	128	8.0
Low-poverty schools	1884	1737	92.2	147	7.8
All elementary schools	7042	6496	92.2	546	7.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	2133	1948	91.3	185	8.7
Low-poverty schools	3697	3477	94.0	220	6.0
All secondary schools	12960	12072	93.1	888	6.9
Comments: For special education 'classes' one special educator equals one class. 2.9% of total core area classes were excluded from the poverty analysis because poverty data was not available.					

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.

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

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	70.9
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	10.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	17.6
Other (please explain)	0.9
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)	77.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	7.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	14.7
Other (please explain)	0.2
Total	100.0
Comments: Other column is special education teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program). 2.9% of total core area assignments were excluded from the poverty analysis because poverty data was not available.	

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	47.1	23.0
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Meals	
Secondary schools	33.5	18.4
Poverty metric used	Free or Reduced Meals- low poverty number is actually 18.37%	
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
0	Dual language			
0	Two-way immersion			
0	Transitional bilingual			
0	Developmental bilingual			
0	Heritage language			
7	Sheltered English instruction			
0	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
11	Content-based ESL			
11	Pull-out ESL			
11	Other (explain)			

Comments: All 11 LEAs/Consortia also reported using a "Self-Contained ESL Class" (focusing on language instruction) at the high school level and/or an "Inclusionary" language instruction educational program (ESL in the classroom).

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.	1121
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
Serbo-Croatian	248
Spanish	224
Vietnamese	186
Maay	140
Chinese	133

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: French, 100; Turkish 62; Russian 49

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	1696
Not tested/State annual ELP	47
Subtotal	1743
LEP/One Data Point	414
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	1089
Not tested/State annual ELP	32
Subtotal	1121
LEP/One Data Point	252
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>No Response</u>
Comments: 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data will be applied to 2008 AMAO decision in April 2008 and will be reported on the 2008 CSPR	

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				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data will be applied to 2008 AMAO decision in April 2008 and will be reported on the 2008 CSPR				

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: 2006-2007 ELP Assessment Data will be applied to 2008 AMAO decision in April 2008 and will be reported on the 2008 CSPR				

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	No Response
Comments: State is still investigating the options of the new flexibility	

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	257
MFLEP/AYP grades	151
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	11
LEP HS/Non-AYP	95
LEP other grades	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 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
166	91	257
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
141	129	91.5	12

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
141	131	92.9	<N

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	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	3
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	
Comments: Only one AMAO was calculated for 2007, AMAO AYP. 2008 AMAOs will be calculated in April 2008 and reported on the 2008 CSPR.	

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>No Response</u>
Comments: AMAOs for Progress and Proficiency will be calculated in April 2008 for 2008. 2007 AMAOs were reported on the 2006 CSPR.	

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
1207	387	2

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>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</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:

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.	57
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.	84
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	35

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	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	8	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	7	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	7	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	587
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	8	48
PD provided to principals	6	22
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	6	26
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	33
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	1	10
Total		726
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
07/01/07	10/01/07	90
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.

The Vermont Title III Program's grant period is October 1 - September 30 rather than July 1 - July 30. There are several reasons that we chose to follow this schedule:

1. It allows us to use the results of the English language proficiency (ELP) assessments which arrive during the summer, providing us with the most up-to-date count of eligible LEP students by district;
2. LEAs have repeatedly said that they prefer submitting the Title III grant in the fall, when staff are back in school again and ready to plan and write the grants;
3. It allows LEAs to plan and implement summer program activities well in advance (which would be difficult to do on the July 1 - June 30 schedule) and provides enough funding to carry them into the first month of school (and tide them over until the October when the next round of Title III funding becomes available).

The LEAs actually don't go 90 days without access to Title III funds. The majority of districts planning according to the October 1 - September 30 schedule and spread their use of the funds out over the year.

The best way to shorten the period for distribution of Title III funds would be:

* Hold Technical Assistance meeting with interested districts in advance to review the criteria for approval of a grant, resulting in less need for revisions and quicker processing in the fall (incomplete grants slow down the approval process).

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	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	72.0
Hispanic	84.0
White, non-Hispanic	85.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	66.0
Limited English proficient	83.0
Economically disadvantaged	71.0
Migratory students	
Male	83.0
Female	87.0

Comments: NGA cohort graduation rates for the 2005-2006 school year. No graduation rate was calculated for Migratory Students. We expect to begin calculating Migratory graduation rates for the 2006-2007 school year.

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	3.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3.8
Hispanic	3.0
White, non-Hispanic	3.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3.6
Limited English proficient	0.3
Economically disadvantaged	5.5
Migratory students	0.0
Male	3.6
Female	2.5
Comments:	

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	60	60
LEAs with subgrants	4	4
Total	64	64
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)	0	51
K	64	
1	72	
2	41	
3	48	
4	43	
5	48	
6	25	
7	29	
8	35	
9	24	
10	30	16
11	31	13
12	26	57
Ungraded	0	111
Total	516	248

Comments: Statewide Total for LEA's with subgrants was 322 even though some cells were suppressed due to N of less than 11.

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	95	196
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	236	50
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	79	61
Hotels/Motels	106	15
Total	516	322

Comments: LEA's without subgrants- unknown & other students were counted with unsheltered
LEA's with subgrants - unknown & other students were counted with unsheltered

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)	51
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	16
11	13
12	57
Ungraded	111
Total	248

Comments: Statewide Total was 322 even though some cells were suppressed due to N of less than 11.

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	70
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	85
Limit English proficient students	

Comments: Blank entry suppressed due to N of less than 11.

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

Comments: Only our 4 subgrants report this information.

Statewide Total for # who took the assessment was 15 even though all cells were suppressed due to N of less than 11.

Statewide Total for # who scored proficient was 11 even though all cells were suppressed due to N of less than 11.

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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		

Comments: Only our 4 subgrants report this information.

Statewide Total for # who took the assessment was 15 even though all cells were suppressed due to N of less than 11.

Statewide Total for # who scored proficient was 7 even though all cells were suppressed due to N of less than 11.

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)	39
K	19
1	36
2	31
3	19
4	24
5	27
6	20
7	16
8	14
9	11
10	<N
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	198
Total	442
Comments: 10. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11	
11. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11	
12. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11	

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.

Vermont's Category 1 counts will continue to decrease as the number of dairy farms in Vermont continues to decrease. According to the dairy milk report milk cows are down by more than 1000. Less cows means less workers. Dairy farm work continues to be the major qualifying activity in Vermont. Also the trend of dairy farm owners hiring young Hispanic (and mostly single) as farm workers and milkers is continuing. These positions were formerly held by migrant Vermont farm workers with young families.

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)	21
K	16
1	12
2	14
3	<N
4	12
5	<N
6	<N
7	11
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	69
Total	131

Comments: 3. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11

5. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11

6. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11

8. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11

9. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11

10. Entry suppressed due to N of less than 11

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.

Category 2 Child Count is down by almost 13%. This reflects the same percentage of decrease in the Category 1 count and for the same reasons.

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.

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Vermont uses MIS2000 to generate both category 1 and 2 counts.2. Yes both last year's and this year's count were generated using MIS2000. |
|---|

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.

ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS RE: Part I Revisions 1.10.3.2

Describe how those data for Category 1 are updated in the student information system for childcount purposes at the state level. Reply: Each year in November, the MEP does a residency verification by cross-checking the MEP database with the State's student demographic database. For every non-match (a student has left, switched schools, preschool students & OSY not in the demographic database, etc), a recruiter goes out and completes an updated COE. The only exception is if we have already updated the COE within the preceding 30 days.

At an [anniversary date or established point-in-time, e.g., Spring], does MEP/LEA personnel conduct another personal interview with families to update student information and eligibility information?

Based on conversations held during other home visits (e.g., to announce PAC meetings, obtain permission slips, etc.) does MEP/LEA staff update student information and eligibility information? Reply: Of course. Each teacher has been trained to use a Move/Data form that is sent in to the database manager to update student information. In addition, each project gets a list of current students monthly. They are instructed to note any changes in data from the list and return it with the corrections.

Are Local Operating Agencies (LOAs) provided student lists that are checked for accuracy [monthly, annually, end-of-project, other _____]? Reply: Monthly

1. Two sets of data are collected and inputted into the database: information from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and information from the performance reports from local projects (received for both regular and summer terms).

2. After a family with potentially eligible migrant students is identified recruiters visit the family to determine their eligibility. A COE is completed and sent to the State's Identification & Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator for initial verification. The COEs are then given to the trained Data Specialist who compares the information to any past information on that family (including comparing student State ID number student name and both parents' names) or student. Data such as birth dates and place of birth are doubly checked to ensure that migrant students that have changed names are not counted twice. The final verification is done by the State Director of Migrant Education who signs every COE. The data is then entered into the MIS2000 database.

3. The data for this report was collected from 9/1/06 through 11/07 and covers the period 9/1/06 through 8/31/07. COEs are collected as completed and performance reports are collected at the end of the regular term and again at the end of the summer term.

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.

All COEs and performance reports come in to one data specialist. The data is first reviewed for accuracy and completeness by both the ID&R Coordinator and by the Data Specialist and then again by the State Director of Migrant Education. The Data Specialist is the only one who inputs the data and in essence controls the database. The database is updated every time a student's situation changes - a move a change in grade leaving the state etc. Monthly reports are created and reviewed for accuracy at both the state and local level. Changes are made if needed.

The Child Count Report was designed according to OME's specifications by Management Services for Education Data in their MIS2000 system. Since implementing this system several test runs were done to ensure that the Child Count information was accurately counting students.

The Migrant Education database is separate but connected to the State's Student Demographic System and to the State's

Education Data Warehouse. The State is able to cross-check information on migrant students. This enables us to verify the accuracy of information. The MEP database is still the only one in the State that records students who are in the state for only a short time.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same procedure is used. The summer session enrollment for the State's category 2 count is reported at the end of summer. Projects have up to 30 days after the end of the summer projects to submit in hard copy the summer student participation reports. When submitted the State Director of Migrant Education approves the reports after clearing up any questions then the Data Specialist enters the information into the database.

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.

ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS re: Part I Revisions 1.10.3.3

For category 1, the SEA can run a query that filters out any child who did not meet the following criteria during the childcount period:
a) Was between the ages of 3-21 (and had not graduated from High School) b) Was within 36 months of QAD and c) Had a 3rd birthday before the end date?

How were children that were residing in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31) counted?

Does MEP/LEA staff telephone a family to confirm residency?

For category 2, the SEA can run a query that filters out any child who did not meet the following criteria during the childcount period:
a) Was between the ages of 3-21 (and had not graduated from High School) b) Was within 36 months of QAD and c) Had a 3rd birthday before the end date?

If the state's category 2 count was generated using a different system than the category 1 count, please describe each system separately. For category 2, the SEA can run a query that filters out any child who did not meet the following criteria during the childcount period: a) Was between the ages of 3-21 (and had not graduated from High School) b) Was within 36 months of QAD and c) Had a 3rd birthday before the end date?

1. The Child Count is a report function of our MIS2000 system. It is designed to only count those students that are between 3 and 21 years of age and made a qualifying move within the past 3 years.

2. Students' towns of residency is a data field on the COE. Residency is annually verified by comparing the students in the Migrant Education database (MIS2000) with the State's Student Demographic database (which is updated each October). A report is generated that confirms residency for students that are enrolled in school in Vermont. Another list is generated for students whose residency cannot be verified by the matching process. For those students recruiters go out and verify residency and update the COE. We do not include students in the Count whose residency is not verified. Students are counted only if they resided in the State for at least one day during the period 9/1/06 through 8/30/07.

3. Each funded local project reports the summer/intersession services each student receives in the summer Performance Report (see attached sample in the hard copy submission). Each year the local projects receive training on the definition of summer/intersession services. From those reports the Data Specialist enters the summer/intersession services each student receives into the MIS2000 database and a summer count report is created. The program only counts those students who receive summer services and are between 3 and 22 and have not yet received their high school diploma. It does not include students on an extended status - those whose LQM was more than 3 years before the start of the summer program.

4. Because only the Data Specialist enters the data she is able to verify that students are only entered once per Child Count category. All students in Vermont are given a nonduplicative identification number in both the MIS2000 and Student Demographic databases. Before an identification number is issued to a student a number of checks are performed - are there any similarities between names birthdays parents or other indicating factors. This is done to insure that the same child is not entered twice. MIS2000 is programmed to only count students with separate identifying numbers once per Child Count category.

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.

Category 2 count is generated using the same system.

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.

ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS re: CSPR Part I Revisions 1.10.3.4

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 is included in the student information system(s)?

Does the SEA have a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that is used statewide?

Is a student eligibility based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult?

Does the SEA review student attendance at summer/inter-session projects?

Does the SEA periodically evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revise procedures?

Are written procedures provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data?

Is the number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a test (re-interview) was completed and the student found eligible included in the report?

Does the state identify the response rate, which exceeds 75 percent of those sampled, and included the reasons for non-response in the report?

Was the sampling statewide overall or stratified by group/ area?

Was the sample size at least 50 re-interviews (sufficient to provide an early warning of problems that may be developing)?

When obtaining data from families, were re-interview conducted systematically and in an approved way, i.e, face to face re-interviews, phone interviews, etc.?

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

Were re-interviewers trained and provided guidance?

Were re-interviewers independent from original interviews?

Accuracy checks are built into each step of the data process. The first step to guarantee accuracy is appropriate training for both recruiters and the Data Specialist. The State ID&R Coordinator trains all new recruiters and holds monthly meetings to talk about recruitment issues and to review eligibility criteria. The Data Specialist often attends these meetings. Frequently the State Director of Migrant Education is asked to attend these meetings to clear up questions regarding eligibility. In addition Vermont supports recruiters' attendance at national trainings. Also the State ID&R Coordinator is responsible for annually updating the recruiters' handbook and it includes the latest OME guidance on recruitment. If there is any question regarding eligibility the State Director of Migrant Education makes the final decision. Vermont has supported attendance by both the ID&R Coordinator and recruiters at the National ID&R Conferences. Vermont is a member of the ConQIR consortium. We have been actively involved in the consortium and have piloted the created forms and procedures.

Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. In some cases schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed a recruiter is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list.

Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy.

In October a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME. Several runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match.

Finally the State has implemented a reinterview procedure to ensure the quality of our data. 20% of each month's COE's receive a reinterview. The manner is modeled after the procedure Vermont used in the voluntary reinterview process requested by OME. It is our plan to complete an external audit once every three years as outlined in our Quality Control 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, 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.

1. Overview

In an attempt to ensure 100% accuracy in the determination of eligible migrant students the VT Migrant Education Program (MEP) conducts an on-going internal audit annually. This process entails re-interviewing families who have had a certificate of eligibility (COE) completed for them by a MEP recruiter to ensure the information collected on the COE is correct and the eligibility decision has not been made erroneously. The following report is a summary of the re-interview process and results for the period between September 1 2006 and August 30 2007.

2. Methodology

As determined by the VT MEP's ID&R Quality Control Plan a 20% random sample was conducted per month for the '06-'07 period. This sample population was determined by tallying all new COEs completed during a given month. From this tally one in every five completed COEs was pulled for re-interviewing. All re-interviews were conducted over the telephone by the state coordinator of ID&R - either Erin Shea (9/06-12/06) or David Chappelle (3/07-8/07). No re-interviews were conducted during December '06 January '07 or February '07 due to vacancy in the ID&R coordinator's position. In all cases the reinterview was completed by someone other than the original recruiter. A standard re-interview protocol was utilized for conducting and recording the interviews.

3. Results

A total of 27 re-interviews were conducted during the review period. This was based on 135 total new COEs collected during the months when quality control efforts were in place. Exactly 20% of new COEs were re-interviewed.

Monthly totals/re-interviews are summarized in the following table (Table 1)

Table 1. Monthly Re-interview Totals

Month	New COEs	Re-interviews Conducted	Total	Erroneous COEs	Notes
-------	----------	-------------------------	-------	----------------	-------

Sept 06	21	4	0		
---------	----	---	---	--	--

Oct 06	10	2	0		
--------	----	---	---	--	--

Nov 06	8	2	0		
--------	---	---	---	--	--

Dec 06	4	0	0	No COEs before E. Shea on leave	12/24
--------	---	---	---	---------------------------------	-------

Jan 07				E. Shea on leave	
--------	--	--	--	------------------	--

Feb 07				D. Chappelle hired	2/22
--------	--	--	--	--------------------	------

Mar 07	9	2	0		
--------	---	---	---	--	--

Apr 07 10 2 0
May 07 20 4 0
Jun 07 17 3 0
Jul 07 23 5 0
Aug 07 13 3 0
Total 135 27 0

All information presented on the COEs collected during the original recruitment interview proved to be accurate. 100% of the reviewed eligibility decisions were accurate and no false eligibility determinations were found.

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.

Information checks are made at least twice before information is entered into the database. The Data Specialist also reviews the data as it is inputted and sends forms back to teachers and recruiters if problems or questions are noted. In some cases schools are called to verify enrollment residency or grade information. In addition various reports are printed monthly to red flag possible problems. For instance lists of eligible students are sent to migrant education teachers each month. If they notice any inconsistencies those are noted and sent back to the Data Specialist for further investigation. If needed a recruiter is sent to reinterview the family to resolve the issues. Finally the MEP list of students is crosschecked with the Vermont Department of Education's Student Demographic database. This verifies residency school and grade of each student on our list.

Since there is only one database in Vermont and only one person inputting the data there are no consolidation issues. Reports from the database are printed monthly and are checked for accuracy.

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.

In October a review is conducted of how the data was gathered and to identify any problem areas or problems with an individual student's eligibility information. All attempts are made to clarify any questions. If any students have remaining issues they are not included in the Child Count. All data is reviewed (for both Category 1 & 2 counts) by both the Data Specialist and the State Director of Migrant Education before it is submitted to OME/EDEN. Several runs of the Child Count are made to ensure that the numbers are correct and the Child Count report is compared to the grade level report to see if the numbers match.

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.

The SEA has already implemented a rigorous quality control plan. In addition through our participation in the ConQIR consortium we have been able to review our procedures with those of other states and against best practices. The consortium has developed a number of "standardized" forms and procedures which we have already begun using. By improving our recruiting procedures and by continually reinterviewing we will attain our goal of a 0% error rate.

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.

We have no concerns.

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

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