

**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**

**CALIFORNIA**



**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 – *21<sup>st</sup> 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: California Department of Education		
Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Debbie Rury		
Telephone: 916-319-0651		
Fax: 916-319-0100		
e-mail: drury@cde.ca.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Gavin Payne		
		<u>Friday, March 7, 2008, 4:27:57 PM</u>
Signature		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.

California has two alternate assessments. The California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards is administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to take the California Standards Tests (CSTs) even with accommodations or modifications. Test blueprints for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics linked to grade-level content standards were adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in March 2006. Test items were field-tested in spring 2007 and operational testing will take place in spring 2008.

The second assessment is a modified assessment based on modified achievement standards called the California Modified Assessment (CMA). This assessment is for students with disabilities for whom both the CAPA and the CSTs are inappropriate.

Test blueprints for the CMA ELA for grades 3-5 and mathematics for grades 3-5 were adopted by the SBE in May 2007. Testing was piloted in fall 2006 field-testing took place in fall 2007 and tests will be operationally administered in spring 2008. In September 2007 the SBE adopted test blueprints in ELA for grades 6-8 and mathematics for grades 6-7. Field testing will take place in fall 2008 and operational testing will take place in spring 2009.

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.

For the CAPA a standard setting for grades 2-11 ELA and mathematics is scheduled for 2009. Alternate academic achievement standards (performance levels) will be considered for adoption by the SBE after standard setting.

For the CMA a standard setting for grades 3-5 ELA and mathematics is scheduled for fall 2008. A standard setting for grades 6-8 ELA and mathematics is scheduled for 2009. Modified academic achievement standards (performance levels) will be considered for adoption by the SBE after standard setting.

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.

Revised test blueprints for the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in science for grades 5, 8, and 10 were adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in March 2006. Items were field-tested in spring 2006 and 2007 with operational testing taking place in spring 2008.

Test blueprints for the California Modified Assessment (CMA) in science for grade 5 were adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in May 2007. Grade 5 science testing was piloted in fall 2006, field-testing took place in fall 2007, and the test is being operationally administered in spring 2008. In September 2007, the SBE adopted a test blueprint for grade 8 science. Field-testing for grade 8 science will take place in fall 2008 and operational testing will take place in spring 2009. A test blueprint for grade 10 science is currently under development and may go to the SBE in May 2008. Field-testing is anticipated to take place in spring 2009 and operational testing is anticipated to take place in spring 2010.

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.

For the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in science, a standard setting for grades 5, 8, and 10 is scheduled for winter 2009. It is anticipated that alternate academic achievement standards (performance levels) will be considered for adoption by the SBE in March 2009.

For the California Modified Assessment (CMA) in science, a standard setting for grade 5 science is scheduled for fall 2008. A standard setting for grade 8 science is scheduled for fall 2009. Standard setting for grade 10 is anticipated to take place in fall 2010. Modified achievement standards (performance levels) will be considered for adoption by the SBE after each standard setting.

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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All students	3379052	3330139	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	28043	27515	98.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	399546	397516	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	263181	257812	98.0
Hispanic	1653898	1635857	98.9
White, non-Hispanic	993997	982212	98.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	366425	354496	96.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1122742	1112550	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1833120	1812536	98.9
Migratory students	79592	79001	99.3
Male	1727209	1704937	98.7
Female	1641444	1625202	99.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	277395	78.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	46764	13.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	30337	8.6
Total	354496	
<b>Comments:</b> Not all of the students with disabilities enrolled were tested and not all that were tested received a performance level.		

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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All students	3378731	3326431	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	28048	27486	98.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	399647	397397	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	263107	257174	97.8
Hispanic	1653554	1633204	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	994013	981915	98.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	366463	348292	95.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1122757	1110377	98.9
Economically disadvantaged students	1833129	1809569	98.7
Migratory students	79614	78859	99.0
Male	1727529	1702341	98.5
Female	1640798	1624090	99.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	287152	82.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30736	8.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	30404	8.7
Total	348292	
<b>Comments:</b> Not all of the students with disabilities enrolled were tested and not all that were tested received a performance level.		

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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	456666	266722	58.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	3730	1845	49.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	51605	41025	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	34448	14585	42.3
Hispanic	233076	113268	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	128319	92529	72.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	50616	18711	37.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	163968	78072	47.6
Economically disadvantaged students	264238	126008	47.7
Migratory students	11159	4616	41.4
Male	233790	138203	59.1
Female	222109	128171	57.7
<b>Comments:</b> The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	455690	171526	37.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3714	1167	31.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	51564	29901	58.0
Black, non-Hispanic	34322	9731	28.4
Hispanic	232614	56042	24.1
White, non-Hispanic	127995	72105	56.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	49399	10993	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	163612	33665	20.6
Economically disadvantaged students	263670	62630	23.8
Migratory students	11124	1680	15.1
Male	232982	79911	34.3
Female	221949	91375	41.2
<b>Comments:</b> The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.			

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

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

**1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	460072	263437	57.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3722	1805	48.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	53682	42947	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	34860	14382	41.3
Hispanic	232480	109853	47.3
White, non-Hispanic	130420	91459	70.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	54378	17640	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	173278	83020	47.9
Economically disadvantaged students	265228	122640	46.2
Migratory students	11302	4602	40.7
Male	235368	133536	56.7
Female	224071	129642	57.9
<p><b>Comments:</b> 1. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.</p> <p>2. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.</p>			

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**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	458818	237431	51.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3706	1741	47.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	53620	38985	72.7
Black, non-Hispanic	34665	13601	39.2
Hispanic	231817	87591	37.8
White, non-Hispanic	130113	92531	71.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	52991	14471	27.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	172743	60798	35.2
Economically disadvantaged students	264353	97659	36.9
Migratory students	11272	2881	25.6
Male	234421	113378	48.4
Female	223768	123817	55.3
<p><b>Comments:</b> 1. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.</p> <p>2. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.</p>			

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.

### 1.3.5 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	468751	230115	49.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	3884	1550	39.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	54836	40303	73.5
Black, non-Hispanic	35727	11746	32.9
Hispanic	233816	87844	37.6
White, non-Hispanic	135788	86156	63.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	56015	14014	25.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	172278	64937	37.7
Economically disadvantaged students	268286	99284	37.0
Migratory students	11317	3394	30.0
Male	239342	117295	49.0
Female	228657	112570	49.2

**Comments:** 1. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

2. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.

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

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	467634	211979	45.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3878	1526	39.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	54782	36489	66.6
Black, non-Hispanic	35566	11541	32.5
Hispanic	233145	72620	31.2
White, non-Hispanic	135573	87233	64.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	54747	11860	21.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	171739	48084	28.0
Economically disadvantaged students	267433	81253	30.4
Migratory students	11269	2403	21.3
Male	238497	100327	42.1
Female	228390	111401	48.8

**Comments:** 1. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

2. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small

increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

3. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.

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	475344	199721	42.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4031	1391	34.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	55477	37644	67.9
Black, non-Hispanic	37024	8987	24.3
Hispanic	233887	67859	29.0
White, non-Hispanic	139984	81586	58.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	52934	8833	16.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	160932	42850	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	266237	76237	28.6
Migratory students	11356	2782	24.5
Male	243138	103001	42.4
Female	231429	96504	41.7

**Comments:** 1. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.

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

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	474718	204115	43.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4024	1553	38.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	55459	36050	65.0
Black, non-Hispanic	36965	10931	29.6
Hispanic	233455	66054	28.3
White, non-Hispanic	139865	87046	62.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	52005	9327	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	160569	36542	22.8
Economically disadvantaged students	265748	73993	27.8
Migratory students	11321	2340	20.7
Male	242622	97983	40.4
Female	231320	105866	45.8

**Comments:** 1. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.

2. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

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

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	479334	195627	40.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3992	1365	34.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	55956	37766	67.5
Black, non-Hispanic	38430	8751	22.8
Hispanic	233236	65892	28.3
White, non-Hispanic	143009	79871	55.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	50097	7484	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	158271	40702	25.7
Economically disadvantaged students	257849	72610	28.2
Migratory students	11373	3075	27.0
Male	245232	101366	41.3
Female	233173	94009	40.3
<b>Comments:</b> 1. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	479406	224589	46.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3991	1693	42.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	55953	38819	69.4
Black, non-Hispanic	38469	12602	32.8
Hispanic	233128	75121	32.2
White, non-Hispanic	143125	93941	65.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	49695	8581	17.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	158087	40429	25.6
Economically disadvantaged students	257774	81532	31.6
Migratory students	11362	2783	24.5
Male	245130	103660	42.3
Female	233338	120632	51.7

**Comments:** 1. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

2. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

3. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5%

in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

4. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

5. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

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**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	472934	159225	33.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3832	998	26.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	56549	33930	60.0
Black, non-Hispanic	37646	6591	17.5
Hispanic	225617	47626	21.1
White, non-Hispanic	144771	68549	47.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46343	6215	13.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	149443	28790	19.3
Economically disadvantaged students	245897	52748	21.5
Migratory students	10962	2329	21.3
Male	241271	80796	33.5
Female	230859	78231	33.9

**Comments:** 1. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.

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

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	479775	202247	42.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	3911	1480	37.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	57024	35009	61.4
Black, non-Hispanic	38539	10708	27.8
Hispanic	228885	61799	27.0
White, non-Hispanic	146729	91124	62.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	47473	7435	15.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	151429	26880	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	249719	65973	26.4
Migratory students	11107	2288	20.6
Male	245344	92897	37.9
Female	233572	109085	46.7

**Comments:** 1. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.

2. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

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

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

**1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	477948	238483	49.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4169	1860	44.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	59321	44179	74.5
Black, non-Hispanic	38077	10796	28.4
Hispanic	210686	73767	35.0
White, non-Hispanic	156365	102724	65.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44454	6961	15.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	132244	40299	30.5
Economically disadvantaged students	210214	74048	35.2
Migratory students	9686	3128	32.3
Male	240570	122059	50.7
Female	232135	113323	48.8

**Comments:** 1. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

2. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

3. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

4. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

5. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

6. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.

7. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.

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 CSRP.

### 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	475767	231803	48.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4141	1926	46.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	59306	38581	65.1
Black, non-Hispanic	37678	12529	33.3
Hispanic	209479	68233	32.6
White, non-Hispanic	155854	105254	67.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	43196	6658	15.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	131649	27888	21.2
Economically disadvantaged students	209036	65071	31.1
Migratory students	9641	2156	22.4
Male	239717	103811	43.3
Female	230792	124900	54.1
<p><b>Comments:</b> 1. California's performance standards are very rigorous resulting in few students scoring at or above proficient; therefore a small increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient triggers the 10% edit check programmed for this section. For example a subgroup that had 25% of their students scoring at or above proficient in 2005-06 and increased the percentage to 27.5% in 2006-07 triggers the edit check even though that 10% increase is below our statewide average increase and well below the expectations for the 2008 targets.</p> <p>2. The percentage of migrant students decreased by 12.5%.</p>			

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	9616	6399	66.6
Districts	1030	548	53.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	6041	3706	61.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4052	2290	56.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1989	1416	71.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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
969	504	52.0
<b>Comments:</b> In California 973 districts received Title I funds in SY 2006-07. Four of those districts combined into two under a common administrative code. As EDEN does not recognize these codes the four districts were excluded from the data counts.		
In 2006 64% of all districts made AYP. However in 2007 53% of all districts made AYP.		
The information pre-populated by <i>EDFacts</i> was updated through manual entry based on data calculated and maintained by the Policy and Evaluation Division.		

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))<sup>1</sup>
- 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

To support an educational system that includes approximately 1,050 Local Education Agencies (LEAs), 9,670 schools, and 6.3 million students, the California Department of Education (CDE) has, out of necessity, adopted a multi-pronged approach to support schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. There were 6,064 schools in California that receive Title I funds in 2006-07. Because of California's high expectations for proficiency on its academic standards, 2,204 of these schools have been identified for Program Improvement (PI) status -- California's equivalent to the federal School Improvement designation -- in 2007-08. Considering these numbers, the CDE has increasingly focused its efforts on building the local capacity of LEAs as a means of providing the essential technical assistance and support for these schools. The CDE engages in the following measures to address the achievement challenges of these schools:

â€¢ Development and maintenance of regulations

â€¢ Application review and approval of supplemental educational service (SES) providers

â€¢ Coordination of written guidance and recommendations for schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring schools subject to intervention under state reform initiatives (A majority of Title I schools are also participants in a state school-reform initiative)

â€¢ Development and maintenance of State Board of Education standards, application review, and approval of providers of school assistance and intervention teams under the state school-reform initiative

â€¢ Development, publication, and training of school district office and county office of education (COE) staffs in the use of state tools for assessing curricular, instructional, assessment, professional development, and data management needs of schools and student groups. (Copies of these tools are available on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/#aps>)

â€¢ Development and training of school districts with large numbers of schools identified for PI, featuring examples and demonstrations of successful school practices occurring in other districts with large numbers of PI schools. (The CDE has hosted "On the Right Track" (OTRT) symposia to highlight the successful strategies that PI schools and districts have used to make AYP and exit PI status and to share these strategies with other schools and districts that are facing the same challenges.)

In addition to state-approved SES providers, the CDE coordinates technical assistance with its educational partners, which include COEs, institutions of higher education, and an array of regional providers. These partners, which includes California's Statewide System of School Support (S4), meet regularly to better align services, identify additional resources, and share effective practices across the state designed to help schools and LEAs make Adequate Yearly Progress.

The S4 includes the CDE, the California Comprehensive Center (CACC) at WestEd, and the eleven COEs in the Regional System of District and School Support (RSDSS). The RSDSS provides direct technical assistance and support to districts and their Title I schools in accordance with NCLB priorities. The CDE administers, coordinates, and provides overall direction to its RSDSS partners. California designates Title I schools identified for school improvement in accordance with NCLB as schools in Years 1 and 2 of PI, schools in corrective action under NCLB as schools in Year 3 of PI, and schools planning for and implementing restructuring under NCLB, respectively, as schools in Year 4 and Year 5 of PI. In accordance with NCLB, schools that make two consecutive years of AYP exit from PI status.

The S4 has incorporated the tools and strategies for improving teaching and learning in Title I LEAs and schools that were developed as part of California's standards-based school reform initiatives. These tools include the nine Essential Program Components (EPCs) which research shows are consistently associated with higher student achievement, grade span Academic Program Surveys (APS) for assessing the extent to which elementary, middle, and high schools have implemented the nine EPCs, and the District Assistance Survey for assessing how well LEAs are supporting improvements in their schools in seven research-based areas. The CDE and the RSDSS have incorporated these tools and strategies into their work with PI LEAs and schools as well as those identified for support and intervention under California's state accountability system.

With the assistance of CACC and RSDSS staff, the CDE has conducted PI training workshops for LEAs and Title I schools through the state since 2005 to support them in meeting NCLB requirements and selecting the best options and strategies for improving student achievement. The CACC is providing professional development and technical assistance to the CDE and to RSDSS directors to enhance their effectiveness in building the capacity of LEAs and their PI schools to improve teaching and learning. The

RSDSS provides leadership, resources, and direct assistance to school districts and schools receiving Title I funds to increase their capacity to provide opportunities for all students to meet or exceed California's standards for proficiency in English language arts and mathematics.

All S4 partners use research-based strategies and practices to improve instruction in PI schools according to NCLB priorities. RSDSS COEs provide direct and customized technical assistance and professional development services to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve student achievement. The RSDSS also provides professional development to LEA and school staff teams to improve their capacity to support improvements in PI schools. The CDE, CACC, and RSDSS COEs continually identify, disseminate, and implement additional strategies for improving teaching and learning based on data evidence. California's S4 exemplifies a constructive working partnership among the SEA, LEAs, and other entities, including the CACC, to provide effective technical assistance, professional development, and management advice to LEAs and schools in PI.

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	256
Extension of the school year or school day	64
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	78
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	124
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	97
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	242
<b>Comments:</b> Please note that these are duplicated counts, since many Title I schools in Year 3 of Program Improvement were implementing two or more Corrective Actions. These data were collected on the Consolidated Application, Part 1, for 2006-07, Page 13, which is completed for every Title I school in Program Improvement in an LEA. These data reflect submissions and revisions through November 2008. Replacement of the principal would be included under "replacement of school staff relevant to the school's low performance" and is, therefore, not a separate category in our data collection.	

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)	47
Reopening the school as a public charter school	2
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	35
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	317
<b>Comments:</b> Please note that these are duplicated counts, since some Title I schools in Year 5 of Program Improvement were implementing two or more Restructuring Actions. These data were collected on the Consolidated Application, Part 1, for 2006-07, Page 13, which is completed for every Title I school in Program Improvement in an LEA. These data reflect submissions and revisions through November 2008. The State of California is not exercising school take-overs as Restructuring Action.	

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 Action<sup>2</sup>)
- 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

California supports an educational system that includes approximately 1000 school districts, 8900 schools and 6.3 million students. Considering these numbers, the California Department of Education has increasingly focused its efforts on building the capacity of county offices of education to help districts in need of improvement (Program Improvement or "PI"). The counties help districts identify and rectify the reasons they failed AYP and using state-developed tools and protocols build their capacity to support their PI schools. To address the achievement problems of these identified districts, these counties engage in the following measures by means of a regional delivery system to increase student achievement benchmarks:

1. Assist identified PI LEAs in their efforts to effectively and successfully to meet the requirements of NCLB
2. Assist LEAs as they address the needs of identified PI schools by providing trainings and technical assistance in the use of state-developed tools and recommended strategies
3. Assist LEAs at risk of PI identification in the transfer of new knowledge and required skills to prevent PI designation

In addition to fiscally supporting the work of the county offices the California Department of Education provides funding for PI districts for up to two years in the amount of \$50,000 for each PI district plus \$10,000 for each school in the district.

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.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> California did not have local educational agencies in corrective action in FY 2006-07.	

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		
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/31/07	08/31/07
<b>Comments:</b> Final determinations based on 2006-07 assessments are expected in February 2008. The vast majority of AYP determinations and improvement designations for districts and schools will remain unchanged after 9/30/07.		

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	10	1
Schools	73	34
<b>Comments:</b> If the final AYP determinations (expected in February 2008) result in AYP changes districts and schools will have the opportunity to appeal the new status within 30 days.		
(Source: 2007 AYP appeals database maintained by the Policy and Evaluation division - data extracted on 12/10/07; 2007 AYP data files dated 10/31/2007 and 8/31/2007.)		

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	09/30/07
---	----------

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.

Section 1003(a) funds were distributed according to California Education Code to support the lowest-achieving Title 1 schools, most of whom are in Program Improvement and the remainder of whom are in the lowest 20 % of the state's schools. In 2006-07 these funds were used as follows:

\$16.3 million was allocated to Program Improvement state-monitored schools and state-monitored schools in PI LEAs to support their work with a School Assistance and Intervention Team and implement corrective actions assigned by the team.

\$15.8 million was allocated to LEAs with large numbers and percentages of PI schools to identify and rectify barriers to student achievement.

\$7 million was allocated to LEAs in Program Improvement to identify and rectify barriers to student achievement.

\$10 million was allocated to LEAs to work PI schools and districts using state protocols to identify and rectify barriers to student achievement.

Additional 1003(a) funds in the amount of \$2.079 million were distributed to Title 1 state-monitored schools not in a PI LEA but which demonstrated the greatest need for funds by virtue of their status in Title 1 and failure to make state accountability targets resulting in state monitoring status.

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

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

**1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.1 Public School Choice**

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

**1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice**

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

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	1113
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	
<b>Comments:</b> *** Schools to which students transfer data are not collected.***	
Source: The Program Improvement Page (13) of the 2007-08 Consolidated Application.	
Date: 11/29/2007	

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	1668774
Who applied to transfer	
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	56710

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
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No Response
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response
<b>Comments:</b> *** Students applying to transfer data are not collected. ***	
*** Students transferring in one or more years are not collected. ***	
Source: Program Improvement Page (13) and Title I Ranking Page (6) of the 2007-08 Consolidated Application.	
Additional Source: EDEN File N010. The 56710 transfers are composed of 15796 transfers under NCLB and 40914 transfers under local choice provisions from a PI to non-PI school.	

Date: 11/29/2007

---

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	\$ 31711182
<b>Comments:</b> *** School Choice expenditure data are not collected. School Choice reservation data have been reported instead. ***	
Source: Title I Part A Reservations Page (25) of the 2006-07 Consolidated Application.	
Date: 11/07/2007	

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	157
<b>Comments:</b> Source: Program Improvement Page (13) and Title I Ranking Page (6) of the 2007-08 Consolidated Application.	
Date: 11/29/2007	

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.<sup>3</sup>
- 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.

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.1 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	1129
<b>Comments:</b> Source: Program Improvement Page (13) of the 2007-08 Consolidated Application.	
Date: 11/29/2007	

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	978367
Who applied for supplemental educational services	
Who received supplemental educational services	70110
<b>Comments:</b> *** Students applying for services data are not collected. ***	
The 70110 student count includes PI Year 1 schools who opted to offer services even though they were not required to do so.	
Source: Program Improvement Page (13) and Title I Ranking Page (6) of the 2007-08 Consolidated Application.	
Additional Source: EDEN File N102	
Date: 11/29/2007	

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	\$ 157239658
<b>Comments:</b> *** Supplemental Educational Services expenditure data are not collected. ***	
Source: Title I Part A Reservations Page (25) of the 2006-07 Consolidated Application.	

Additional Source: EDEN File N102

Date: 11/07/2007

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	649833	590781	90.9	59052	9.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	106137	100773	94.9	5364	5.1
Low-poverty schools	50678	49351	97.4	1327	2.6
All elementary schools	156815	150124	95.7	6691	4.3
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	277265	239185	86.3	38080	13.7
Low-poverty schools	215753	201472	93.4	14281	6.6
All secondary schools	493018	440657	89.4	52361	10.6
<p><b>Comments:</b> Data source = October 2006 California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) - Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF).</p> <p>Numbers indicate all secondary classes including alternative education special education schools unidentified programs K-12 programs and middle/junior highs.</p> <p>Credentialing rules and regulations (not under the Dept. of Ed) make combining these programs problematic. We provide the following breakdown for accuracy of reporting:</p> <p>Comprehensive High Schools: 274936 classes 251662 HQT classes (91.5%); Special Education 15455 classes 9221 (59.6); Low Poverty 139722 classes 131710 HQT classes (94.2%) Special Education 6688 classes 4603 HQT classes (68.8%); High Poverty 135214 classes 119952 HQT classes (88.7%) Special Education 8767 classes 4618 HQT classes (52.6%)</p> <p>Middle/Junior High: 182932 classes 161052 HQT classes (88.0%); Special Education 13688 classes 9340 HQT classes (68.2%); Low Poverty 62479 Classes 58635 HQT classes (93.8%) Special Education 4148 classes 3482 HQT classes (83.9%); High Poverty 120453 classes 102417 HQT classes (85.0%) Special Education 9540 classes 5858 HQT classes (61.6%)</p> <p>Alternative Education: 30400 classes 24558 HQT classes (80.7%); Special Education 1068 classes 642 HQT classes (60.1%)</p> <p>Special Education Programs: 3304 classes 2107 HQT classes (63.7%)</p> <p>Unidentified Programs: 1446 classes 1278 HQT classes (88.3%); Special Education 224 classes 159 HQT classes (70.9%).</p>					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide

direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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.

California counts self-contained elementary classes as 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	88.4
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	11.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
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)	77.6
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0
<b>Comments:</b> We are unable to connect teacher data to classroom in our current system therefore we are unable to report the number of classes taught by someone who does not hold at least a preliminary credential or intern permit in their assignment field. However we are able to report that there are 1713 elementary classroom teachers who hold Provisional Intern Permits (PIP) Short Term Staff Permits (STIP) or are teaching under a waiver. There are 7502 secondary teachers who hold Provisional Intern Permits (PIP) Short Term Staff Permits (STIP) or are teaching under a waiver.	

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.

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	33.1	16.8
Poverty metric used	Percent of enrolled students in the federal free or reduced price meals program	
Secondary schools	28.8	21.1
Poverty metric used	Percent of enrolled students in the federal free or reduced price meals program	
<b>Comments:</b> The data is determined using the 3343 secondary programs and the 5561 elementary programs that reported poverty data on the October 2006 California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) - Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF).		

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:**

1. **# 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.)**)
2. **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.ncele.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% 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).
5. **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
	Dual language			
	Two-way immersion			
	Transitional bilingual			
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
	Sheltered English instruction			
	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
	Content-based ESL			
	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			

**Comments:** California is unable to provide this Biennial data on an annual basis. California will collect this data from Title III subgrantees in fall 2008 and will report this data when Section 1.6 of the 2006-07 CSPR is re-opened for states needing to enter this Title III Biennial data.

The inability to provide Biennial data on an annual basis has been discussed and approved by Margarita Pinkos Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA. Reference: December 7 2007 CSPR Title III WebEx.

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.	1559146
<p><b>Comments:</b> This number is a one-day count of all LEP students in Title III funded subgrantees on the March 2007 Language Census. This number does not match the LEP testing status table for the following reasons. This number includes all students who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes in 2006-07 and were classified as LEP as of that day. It does not include LEP students who took the annual test in the fall and are no longer enrolled. Students who were reclassified as R-FEP after taking the annual test would also not be counted on the census day.</p> <p>EDEN number of 1,567,909 is being retracted as it is in error and included all LEP, not just Title III LEP.</p>	

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 C SPR.

### 1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	1338611
Vietnamese	34356
Filipino (Pilipino or Tagalog)	21435
Cantonese	21388
Hmong	21047

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

**Comments:** The source of data for 1.6.2.2 is the March 2007 Language Census.

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 C SPR.

**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.

<b>ALL LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	1311112
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	1311112
LEP/One Data Point	397973

**Comments:** "Tested/State Annual ELP" include only those students who were previously identified as LEP and took the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) during the 2006-07 annual assessment window (July 1 2006 - October 31 2006). The annual assessment window is a four-month period to allow ample opportunity for every LEP student to be assessed. The data in "LEP/One Data Point" include only those students who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes in 2006-07. The students who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes are not included in the "Tested/State annual ELP" column. CELDT results are only one criteria for LEP determination and local educational agencies have discretion in determining LEP status. Therefore California does not have data regarding how many of the students in the "LEP/One Data Point" were ultimately determined to be LEP.

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	1304359
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	1304359
LEP/One Data Point	393599
<p><b>Comments:</b> "Tested/State Annual ELP" include only those Title III students who were previously identified as LEP and took the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) during the 2006-07 annual assessment window (July 1 2006 - October 31 2006). The annual assessment window is a four month period to allow ample opportunity for every LEP student to be assessed. The data in "LEP/One Data Point" include only those students who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes in 2006-07. The students who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes are not included in the "Tested/State annual ELP" column. CELDT results are only one criteria for LEP determination and local educational agencies have discretion in determining LEP status. Therefore California does not have data regarding how many of the students in the "LEP/One Data Point" were ultimately determined to be LEP.</p>	

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

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

**1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results**

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

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

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

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

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	48.7	655387	52.4	Y
No progress		594987		
ELP attainment	27.2	205912	31.3	Y
<b>Comments:</b> The ELP attainment number in the Results column is a subset of the students Making progress. The starting point for the AMAOs is the number of Annual testers because all annual testers should have the two years of data that are necessary to calculate the AMAOs. There were 1,304,259 annual testers in Title III subgrantees and 1,250,374 of these students had the required two years of data. We did not have the necessary two years of data for 53,985 students or 4.1 % of the annual testers. These students could not be included in the AMAO calculations. If a Title III funded subgrantee did not have at least 65 % of their annual testers with the required two years of data, then no AMAO values were calculated and the Title III subgrantee failed AMAOs 1 and 2.				

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				
<b>Comments:</b> This section does not apply to California.				

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	Yes
<b>Comments:</b> California was granted comparable flexibility in 2003 as per the approved State Accountability Workbook dated June 3 2003.	

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	
MFLEP/AYP grades	
<b>Comments:</b> California is unable to provide this Biennial data on an annual basis. California will analyze this data in fall 2008 and will report this data when Section 1.6 of the 2006-07 CSPR is re-opened for states needing to enter this Title III Biennial data.	
The inability to provide Biennial data on an annual basis has been discussed and approved by Margarita Pinkos Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA. Reference: December 7 2007 CSPR Title III WebEx.	

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	539791
LEP HS/Non-AYP	271024
LEP other grades	18972
<b>Comments:</b> In California grade 2 results are included in district and school AYP determinations. Total LEP students by grade is: K = 189564; grade 1 = 183037; grade 2 = 167190. Source = Dataquest report state level number of English Learners by language 2006-07. Date extracted = 12/07/07.	

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).	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> In 2006-07 the Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS) were administered in grades 2, 3 and 4 but the test results were not used for NCLB accountability decisions.	

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	
<b>Comments:</b> The Standards-based Tests in Spanish referenced in 1.6.3.5.1 above is not currently used for NCLB accountability decisions.	

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	
<b>Comments:</b> The Standards-based Tests in Spanish referenced in 1.6.3.5.1 above is not currently used for NCLB accountability decisions.	

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
<b>Comments:</b>		

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
<b>Comments:</b>		

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
<b>Comments:</b> California does not analyze this biennial data on an annual basis. California will report this data in 2008.		

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

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:** California is unable to provide this Biennial data on an annual basis. California will collect this data from Title III subgrantees in fall 2008 and will report this data when Section 1.6 of the 2006-07 CSPR is re-opened for states needing to enter this Title III Biennial data.

The inability to provide Biennial data on an annual basis has been discussed and approved by Margarita Pinkos Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA. Reference: December 7 2007 CSPR Title III WebEx.

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

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:** California is unable to provide this Biennial data on an annual basis. California will collect this data from Title III subgrantees in fall 2008 and will report this data when Section 1.6 of the 2006-07 CSPR is re-opened for states needing to enter this Title III Biennial data.

The inability to provide Biennial data on an annual basis has been discussed and approved by Margarita Pinkos Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA. Reference: December 7 2007 CSPR Title III WebEx.

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	602
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	323
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	119
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	84
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	14
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	21
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	92
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	17
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	17
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	58
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	68
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	12
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	105
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	95
<p><b>Comments:</b> AMAOs were computed for all Title III subgrantees. If a Title III funded subgrantee did not have at least 65 % of their annual testers with the required two years of data, then no AMAO values were calculated and the Title III subgrantee failed AMAOs 1 and 2.</p> <p>The 105 subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for 2004-05 and 2005-06 submitted an improvement plan. The improvement plan for the 12 LEAs that did not meet AMAOs for the two consecutive years of 2005-06 to 2006-07 is not due until Jan. 18, 2008.</p> <p>The 95 subgrantees did not meet AMAOs for the 4 consecutive years of 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07.</p> <p>California Education Code 35111(a) allows elementary and high school districts that have the same governing board to be treated as a single school district for accountability purposes. The California Department of Education treats Santa Rosa Elementary School District and Santa Rosa High School district as one LEA for the purposes of Title III accountability. Petaluma City Elementary and Petaluma Joint Union High School Districts are also treated as one LEA for the purposes of Title III accountability.</p> <p>Data retrieved Dec. 14, 2007.</p>	

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

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

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

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

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

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

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.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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
240987	156936	284

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

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

<p><b>Comments:</b> California is unable to provide this Biennial data on an annual basis. California will collect this data from Title III subgrantees in fall 2008 and will report this data when Section 1.6 of the 2006-07 CSPR is re-opened for states needing to enter this Title III Biennial data.</p> <p>The inability to provide Biennial data on an annual basis has been discussed and approved by Margarita Pinkos Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA. Reference: December 7 2007 CSPR Title III WebEx.</p>
---

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		
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students		
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community-based organization personnel		
Total		
<p><b>Comments:</b> California is unable to provide this Biennial data on an annual basis. California will collect this data from Title III subgrantees in fall 2008 and will report this data when Section 1.6 of the 2006-07 CSPR is re-opened for states needing to enter this Title III Biennial data.</p> <p>The inability to provide Biennial data on an annual basis has been discussed and approved by Margarita Pinkos Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA. Reference: December 7 2007 CSPR Title III WebEx.</p>		

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
7/01/06	2/9/07	224
<b>Comments:</b> Subgrantees were awarded spending authority in December 2006.		
Immigrant funds were available to subgrantees Feb. 9 2007.		
LEP funds were available to subgrantees March 2 2007.		

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.

<p>The appropriation of all state and federal funding in California is subject to the approval of the State Legislature and Governor. Until such time as the annual State Budget Act is formally approved, the CDE may make no allocations to subgrantees.</p> <p>Additionally, due to the restrictions of the federal cash management process, the CDE must collect and analyze subgrantee expenditure reports for the prior budget period in order to ascertain sufficient expenditures as to warrant the release of new funds. Subgrantees generally close their accounting books during September-November only after which time they may accurately report final expenditures for any given fiscal year. Thus the CDE generally requires until early December to process fully the determination of subgrantee funding.</p> <p>Further, the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, as emphasized during annual program audits, dictate a hierarchy of approval for the proposed subgrantee allocations. Such an approval process demands several weeks time.</p> <p>In an effort to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees, the CDE is analyzing the possibility of establishing a subgrantee expenditure reporting system online. This online process, currently being studied as a potential department-wide solution, would address cash management in a universal manner, and may include options such as Web-based expenditure reporting, changes to the reporting period, IT enhancements to expedite determination of meeting cash thresholds, and the CDE approval process. Such an online reporting system would significantly reduce subgrantee reporting errors while also making efficient the data analysis and ultimately reduce the time of distribution of funds to subgrantees.</p>
--

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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	83.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	79.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	70.3
Hispanic	75.6
White, non-Hispanic	90.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	75.9
Limited English proficient	68.0
Economically disadvantaged	74.9
Migratory students	78.7
Male	80.8
Female	85.3

**Comments:** Source of data: California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) - October 2006. The reason that the Children with disabilities student group is more that 10% higher than last year is that last year it was calculated using a different formula since the data needed for the correct calculation was not available.

Note on all EDEN derived graduation rates. These all appear to be accurate although some of them vary by tenths of a percent from our calculations which we believe to be due to rounding. The EDEN derived Grad rates were used in this submission.

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	3.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.3
Black, non-Hispanic	6.1
Hispanic	4.6
White, non-Hispanic	2.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3.0
Limited English proficient	7.6
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	2.7
Male	3.9
Female	3.1
<b>Comments:</b> Source of data: California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) - October 2006 and Migrant Education system for grade 9-12 migrant enrollment. Economically disadvantaged data not available this year. California will have this data next year.	

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	1496	1341
LEAs with subgrants	95	92
Total	1591	1433

**Comments:** The LEAs without subgrants that did not report this data are direct-funded charter schools. These charter schools are not required to complete California's Consolidated Application, the vehicle for reporting this data. We are currently looking at alternative ways to collect this data from these charters for next year.

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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2806	1948
K	9790	5341
1	10371	6155
2	9959	6243
3	9603	6196
4	8918	5763
5	9011	5968
6	8388	5542
7	7994	4578
8	7577	4665
9	7710	5050
10	6645	4292
11	5544	3405
12	5015	3365
Ungraded	0	172
Total	109331	68683

**Comments:** The "ungraded" line was not collected statewide due to the timing of U.S. Department of Education's release of the data collection requirements. Some subgrantees were able to start the collection process for this information. All subgrantees will be able to collect this data for next year.

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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	14717	10102
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	77256	48110
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	7257	4725
Hotels/Motels	10101	5746
Total	109331	68683

**Comments:**

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

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

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1791
K	5368
1	5914
2	6110
3	6269
4	5724
5	6049
6	5368
7	4983
8	4981
9	5169
10	4426
11	3442
12	3491
Ungraded	246
Total	69331

**Comments:** The total number of homeless students that were served for the 2006-07 school year decreased from the prior year. California's subgrantee include more county offices of education rather than school districts. County offices utilize their funds to provide more indirect services, such as technical assistance and professional development for local district personnel, rather than direct services, such as tutoring, dissemination of school supplies, and referrals.

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	2766
Migratory children/youth	1942
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4791
Limit English proficient students	20235
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	64
2. Expedited evaluations	56
3. Staff professional development and awareness	83
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	79
5. Transportation	84
6. Early childhood programs	39
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	85
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	57
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	77
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	82
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	84
12. Counseling	56
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	62
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	78
15. School supplies	84
16. Referral to other programs and services	85
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	65
18. Other (optional)	24
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
<b>Comments:</b> 24 Subgrants provided other educational support services that were not listed here. Many of the educational support services included working with food service providers, translating for parents in written as well as verbal form, and referrals to housing agencies.	

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	38
2. School Selection	43
3. Transportation	51
4. School records	40
5. Immunizations	28
6. Other medical records	19
7. Other Barriers	35
<b>Comments:</b> Here is a list of barriers that subgrantees still face:  Lack of sufficient collaboration with other LEAs(18), frequent moves of families, lack of funding and LEA support, homeless fraud, identification of unaccompanied youth, multi-track LEAs, time management, lack of housing options, immigration, family behaviors including trust issues, and shelter time restraints.	

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	4799	1115
4	4707	1264
5	4291	1121
6	4708	1166
7	4238	993
8	3915	772
High School	9314	2134
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	4796	2055
4	4708	1810
5	4299	1381
6	4707	1206
7	4244	897
8	3859	613
High School	8401	933
<b>Comments:</b>		

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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23394
K	11005
1	8976
2	14906
3	14349
4	14335
5	14568
6	14288
7	14533
8	14665
9	13143
10	13699
11	13178
12	15816
Ungraded	568
Out-of-school	39519
Total	240942
<b>Comments:</b> Source: The Migrant Student Information Network(MSIN) California's Migrant Education Program statewide data system.	

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.

There were several factors that contributed to the 11% decrease from last year's student counts. The reduction on the amount of farm land in some areas of the state and the decline in the availability of affordable housing were significant contributing causes to the decline in migrant families. Also the current political climate surrounding immigration prompted many migrant families not to move as often as they did in previous years therefore the numbers of eligible families has decreased nationwide and also in California. Stricter State Quality Control guidelines have also impacted student eligibility determinations.

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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12394
K	5033
1	8530
2	8702
3	8586
4	8782
5	8719
6	8102
7	8209
8	6935
9	7444
10	7067
11	6206
12	2824
Ungraded	140
Out-of-school	13395
Total	121068
<b>Comments:</b> Source: The Migrant Student Information Network(MSIN) California's Migrant Education Program statewide data system.	

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.

There are several reasons that contributed to the 19% decrease from last year's student counts. The current political climate surrounding immigration prompted many migrant families not to move as often as they did in previous years therefore the numbers of eligible families has decreased nationwide and also in California. Due to accountability issues each summer a large number of California's school districts are required to offer summer school programs for at- risks students which reduces the number of students eligible to participate in summer programs funded by the Migrant Education Regional Programs. Stricter State Quality Control guidelines have also impacted student eligibility determinations.

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.

Migrant Education Regional Offices entered Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar (software program) by TROMIK. The Migrant Education Regions then used COEstar to transmit records electronically to the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) server at WestEd. The same systems were used to generate child counts for the last reporting period.

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.

a. Data Collected: The regional offices entered Certificates of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar. COEstar assigns a regional "COEstar number to track records. The COEDATA table contains Certificate of Eligibility (COE) information; the I.D. tables contains student information such as school of enrollment birth date and grade level; the SH tables contains school history information such as date of enrollment withdrawal date and the school year and the SUPPROGS table contains support services information. All data are collected from the local Migrant Regional Office. To differentiate between a summer/intersession service and a regular term service a summer service is coded with an "S" and an Intersession service is coded as "I".

b. Activities Conducted to Collect the Data: The data collection beings at the Regional level or in the case of directly funded districts at the school district level. Recruiters assigned to the Migrant Regional Offices are community based. District recruiters can be school based or they can perform community based identification and recruitment. In conducting the eligibility interviews all recruiters begin by using the Basic Interview Pattern (BIP) a tool for standardizing the interview process. A state developed COE is used to record the migrant family's eligibility for the MEP. Community based recruiters search out eligible migrant families by going to apartment complexes labor camps flea markets Laundromats public service agencies and in the fields.

Community based recruiters use a paper COE or an electronic version suing the Tablet PC. All COE data including signatures are captured on the electronic form. In the conventional method using the paper COE when the form has been completed the recruiter the reviewer assess the form for accuracy and completeness and signs the COE. The COE is submitted to the data entry section for input into the local database (COEstar). Before the COE information is permanently applied to the local database a final quality review is conducted; the data entry operator is also instructed to perform a search of the database to see if a qualifying COE already exists for the same qualifying move that is to be recorded.

The process for collecting COE data on the Tablet PC has been modified to take advantage of the benefits of the technology. Because the host system and the Tablet PC are synchronized almost daily the recruiter conducts the search for a potential duplicate in the field and thus reduces the possibility of creating a duplicate record. At the end of the day the mobile unit (Tablet PC) is connected to the district or regional network and the data is transferred to a QA machine for review before the COE is verified and applied to the database.

I&R supervisors generate monthly End of Eligibility (EOE) Reports that are used by recruiters to contact families whose eligibility is about to expire to see if they have had a new qualifying move. Student lists are also produced and distributed to school districts to determine if previously enrolled students are still present at the start of every regular term before a new enrollment is entered into COEstar.

To collect Summer/Intersession service information the districts/regions utilize standard enrollment lists that are available through COEstar to record the types of services that provided to the students. The completed service roster/lists are submitted to the data entry staff for input. The data files containing all the data mentioned can be submitted daily to the MSIN (statewide system) if needed.

c. When Were Data Collected: I&R is a year-round activity. Regional offices have been instructed by CDE to submit data via COEstar as existing records are updated or new COEs are created. During peak migration periods district/regional data transfers can occur daily.

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.

Migrant Education Regional Offices enter and transmit the student data files containing all added updated and deleted COE data via COEstar. Transmittal of the records is done electronically (via FTP or the Global Data Transfer System (GDTS) an alternate secure internet connection to the MSIN server at WestEd. Records are updated for every term regular and summer/intersession terms. Students are withdrawn and then re-enrolled with current information at the beginning of each session. WestEd used automated

procedures to detect new files that were received from the regional offices. WestEd has software that compares data fields with existing records to detect a match. Fields such as name birth date and parents' names are compared for a match. If a child received summer/intersession services the type of service and service date/s were entered into the local system. This information is also sent electronically to the statewide database. These files were then decompressed and decrypted. The student records were then updated with the academic or support service information.

The records were then imported into a master database where eligibility for category 1 and 2 were determined according to the decision rules established via CDE and vendors and based on Federal law/rules which establishes student eligibility enrollment and services. These rules are used to train all identification and recruitment staff as well as the data entry staff. The COE Instructions Identification and Recruitment Manual and Data Entry Instructions contain all of the procedures that are followed with respect to recruitment as well as verifying information for eligibility.

An additional quality check was the validation of critical fields. COEstar did key field validation at input. This check ensures that all of the fields required to determine eligibility have been collected and recorded.

Management and QA reports are produced and shared with the regional offices to confirm receipt of the records to confirm eligibility and as tools to assist with improving data quality. Additional reports are available on the Migrant Student Locator a web-based tool that allows regional offices to monitor the status of all records in the statewide database and view student histories. This allows the regional offices to view the records and submit updates or corrections if necessary.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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.

The COEstar system is the software used to collect all of the student data pertaining to program eligibility and other student information. The Performance Reporter is designed to produce reports specifically requested by the Federal government pertaining to all migrant program information. WestEd receives all of the data collected with COEstar and checks for duplicates as well as compiles reports of different data elements as requested by regions as well as the federal government.

Migrant Education staff was trained to complete accurate COEs based on Federal Program eligibility criteria. The COEs were checked via regional process before entering COEs via COEstar on a COE screen. Since COEstar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility (COE) all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time counts are performed. Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can 1. Be counted for funding and 2. Be counted for services. Each year information is updated via personal interviews with families. This allows student information to be updated yearly if not more frequently. Once a student graduates from high school that student's information is updated and the student is then flagged as no longer eligible. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered into databases multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). The additional checks involve the use of a WestEd internet-based application that allows regional staff to check data fields such as name birth date place of birth and parents' names as well as make direct comparisons of electronic versions of the source documents to further eliminate duplicates.

students who were resident in your state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1-8/31);

Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records QAD dates Residency dates Enrollment dates Withdrawal dates Departure dates LEP Needs Assessments and Graduation/Termination dates Special Services dates and Health record dates performed in the state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate they left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began. The State does assume that the inputted data with respect to COE information is correct. There are quality control checks that exist prior to entering information into the database. When a recruiter gathers information from a family and records it on a COE another staff person reviews the COE for completeness and accuracy.

students who—in the case of category 2--received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment and service in a summer or intersession term in order to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Descriptions of services indicate the nature of services. In addition summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still with in the 3-year eligibility period when service began.

Students once per child count category.

COEstar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state region county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level eligible children are counted once statewide in each eligible category.

WestEd checks each incoming ID record against the statewide database to determine if the same student is already in the system (e.g. to identify a potential match with an already existing student record). Possible outcomes include: a. exact matches on all matching criteria b. no match (less than 5 criteria match) c. possible match (5 or more criteria match). The criterion includes student name school of enrollment and parents' names. When possible matches are identified they are flagged and sent back to the region to determine if there is a match or if the student is new.

WestEd assigns a unique statewide identification number (MSD) to each unique record. Possible matches are assigned the same MSD number. Unique numbers are reserved for half of a potential pair of duplicates.

The regions view data records containing possible matches on-line. Regions research the information to determine if possible matched records represent the same or unique children. Regions use the Duplicate Resolution screen on the Migrant Student Information Network locator site (developed by WestEd) to research and resolve potential duplicates. Regions that share the potential duplicates can research independently while seeing what the other region has determined. Students who are in fact unique are immediately reassigned new MSD numbers in the central database. The changes/updates are returned electronically to the regions to keep the local database synchronized with the local COEstar database.

WestEd prepares the statewide count based on the unique MSD number and the "decision rules" used for regional level reports. Any intra-regional or inter-regional duplicated are thereby eliminated from the statewide performance report counts.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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.

The CA MEP has developed a web based I & R Issues Clarification Center to assure consistency in the interpretation of eligibility guidance and uniform application of eligibility criteria statewide. The purpose of this center is to provide policy and procedure information for I&R topics which are unclear or unaddressed in the I&R Manual. Regional staff first address their questions to their I&R Supervisor/Advisory Committee member. Committee members are encouraged to post questions directly into this site. Questioners who prefer anonymity can send questions to CDE by email and their questions appear anonymously. The State I&R Support Team after deliberation and consultation post a discussion and answer to each question. Every effort is made to respond in a timely manner. All Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) members (there are currently over 1000 active account members representing the 23 Migrant Regional Offices School Districts Migrant Programs and State Staff members) can view all the postings. Once the answer has received final approval by the CDE Migrant Office it is effective immediately. Issues that generate an update to the I&R Manual will be addressed in periodic "Updates to the I&R Manual" posted in the MSIN Intranet Documents section.

The California Department of Education (CDE) has instructed the subgrantees (regions) to perform "Quality Control" checks on all COEs via each regional office's internal procedures. CDE has developed the following quality control documents to guide the regions in establishing effective and efficient procedures and staff training:

â€¢ Identification and Recruitment Manual

â€¢ California Quality Assurance Guidelines for Collecting and Entering Data

â€¢ COE Instructions (incorporated into the I&R Manual)

"Second person" checks of COEs are part of the process. If information of a COE is in question a follow-up visit/interview is conducted. In addition the CDE I&R manual contains a Certificate of Eligibility Monitoring Checklist and instructions on how to use this checklist. CDE consultants are assigned regions/subgrantees to monitor on an ongoing basis. The process includes the I&R component. The state Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM) process includes random sampling and review of COEs. Also each region has established a quality control process prior to the entry of information from the COE into the COEstar database.

Migrant Education staffs responsible for interviewing migrant families and completing COEs receive ongoing training at the regional level and also statewide training is provided. Statewide training is provided annually at the Migrant Student Identification and Recruitment and Data Training. At the regional level it is common practice for staff to meet once a month for training.

At the collection/electronic-input stage COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Each COE can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

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.

The SEA requires the regional offices to implement ongoing quality control procedures to ensure accurate eligibility determinations throughout the year. In addition the SEA requires the regions to maintain these records on file for audit purposes. If children are found to be ineligible the SEA requires the regional office to delete these children from their database. The SEA did not conduct a re-interview process during 2007.

During the spring and summer of 2007 California underwent a review of the documentation supporting the state reported defect rate in the Migrant Education Program that was conducted by the Aguirre Division of JBS International. This process found all documents and procedures to be satisfactory and the defect rate as reported was found to be valid.

Recently California was asked to review and comment on the draft: "Technical Assistance Guide On Re-Interviewing" that Nicole Vicinanza from JBS International is preparing. As a result of this experience California is currently in the process of updating its

statewide quality control procedures to include both a prospective and retrospective re-interview process.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The vendors provide reports to CDE and the Regional offices on an ongoing basis. The reports include student information with respect to eligibility. It provides regional directors current information with respect to their current recruitment efforts. If the child counts in a region(s) is much lower or higher than the year before vendors and CDE consultants work with the regions to insure that the data is correct. Data are checked for completeness throughout the year.

In addition COEstar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data. Since all COEstar data originates with the collection of the COE COEstar is included in the overall quality control process. Additional data like enrollment and services data is thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

COEstar does not merge data. All data kept by COEstar databases is relational based on internal keys and all information for a child is related. The system does support data synchronization between multiple stand-alone systems using very accurate and proprietary technology developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation. This method relies on record stamping using keys and data signatures to determine how data is exchanged and consolidated. The process is similar to other database synchronization methods but is much more refined and precise.

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

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Department of Education Migrant Indian and International Education Office has a consultant assigned to review the sub-reports submitted by the vendors. The consultant checks these reports against the sub-reports before the information is entered on to the Annual Performance Report form and submitted to the Federal Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The report is checked against the last report (in terms of large increases and/or decreases) it is checked by sections in terms of federal requirements it is checked for possible math and/or content errors. It should be noted that these final steps taken by CDE have been preceded by the electronic check via COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter; all numbers are double and triple checked against other sources to insure accuracy. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor child counts as part of the quality control process.

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

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

Describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

California is currently in the process of updating its statewide quality control procedures to include both a prospective and retrospective re-interview process. These procedures will outline improved processes for collecting reporting and validating the accuracy of eligibility determinations and corrective actions.

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.

The CDE reviewed the Category 2 Child Counts and corrections were made to the discrepancies that were found.

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

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