

**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**

**GEORGIA**



**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: Georgia Department of Education		
Address: 2066 Twin Towers East Atlanta, GA 30334		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Jeff Gagne		
Telephone: 404-656-3348		
Fax: 404-651-6867		
e-mail: jgagne@doe.k12.ga.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Stuart Bennett, Chief Deputy		
		Friday, March 14, 2008, 9:57:48 AM
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.

Georgia's reading/language arts mathematics and science standards were subjected to a precision review in 2006. The precision review of the standards involved an Advisory Committee for each content area feedback from Local Education Agencies and an Educator Writing Team. The results of the precision review were reviewed by each Advisory Committee. Any changes or edits indicated by the review were submitted to the State Board of Education in July of 2006 for approval. The public was given opportunity to submit comments via the GDOE website and focus groups within the training sessions. The role of public comment was critical to the revision of the standards. The State Board of Education directed the GDOE to perform yearly precision reviews to ensure the academic content standards accurately and fully describe what students in Georgia are expected to know and do at each grade level and/or high school course.

As of spring of 2008 the academic content standards in all assessed grade levels in reading/language arts and science will be fully implemented into Georgia classrooms and state assessments as will grades 1 through 8 mathematics. High school mathematics will begin its implementation in the high schools in the fall of 2008 with aligned End of Course assessments for Mathematics I. The high school mathematics curriculum will continue implementation as the freshmen of the fall of 2008 progress through high school.

As a result of the revisions in Georgia's academic content standards Georgia has passed new graduation requirements for students entering ninth grade in the fall of 2008. The new requirements include four years each of English/Language Arts mathematics and science. Each content area has specified courses required for students to graduate from a Georgia high school.

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.

During the 2006-2007 school year Georgia implemented a new alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards for grades K - 8 and 11 in the content areas of English/language arts mathematics science and social studies. Additionally a new mathematics assessment was implemented in grades 1 - 2 and 7 due to the state's curricular transition to the Georgia Performance Standards in these grades.

During the 2007-2008 school year a new mathematics assessment will be implemented in grades 3 - 5 and 8 due to the implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards in these grades.

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.

During the 2006-2007 school year academic achievement standards were set for the new mathematics tests in grades 1 - 2 and 7. Additionally academic achievement standards were set for the new alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards in grades K - 8 and 11 in English/language arts mathematics science and social studies.

During the 2007 - 2008 school year academic achievement standards will be set for new mathematics assessments in grades 3 - 5 and 8 as well as for a new English/language arts assessment in grade 11.

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.

Georgia has a long history with science assessments. The state administers science assessments in grades 3 - 8 and 11. During the 2006-2007 school year Georgia implemented a new alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards in science in grades 3 - 8 and 11.
--

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.

Georgia has implemented academic achievement standards for its science assessments for a number of years however during the 2006-2007 school year new academic achievement standards were adopted and implemented in grades 3 - 5 and 8. This was necessitated by the state's curricular transition to the Georgia Performance Standards in these grades. Additionally alternate achievement standards were set for the state's newly implemented alternate assessment (grades 3 - 8 and 11).

During the 2007-2008 school year Georgia will adopt and implement new academic achievement standards in grade 11 due to the transition to the Georgia Performance Standards.

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

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

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

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

**1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	827802	824595	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1128	1122	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	24463	24398	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	317682	316096	99.5
Hispanic	73401	73198	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	389286	388004	99.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	106849	105790	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34565	34463	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	422583	420769	99.6
Migratory students	2128	2117	99.5
Male	420539	418628	99.6
Female	407263	405967	99.7
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial data: Total enrolled is 21842. Total tested is 21777.			

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	27133	25.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	71035	67.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7723	7.3
Total	105891	
<b>Comments:</b> This number is correct because it includes the multi-racial subgroup. This list is not provided for within the student group list in CSPR. This is the total number tested not total number enrolled.		

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

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	733607	730332	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	978	973	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	21435	21072	98.3
Black, non-Hispanic	282391	281386	99.6
Hispanic	68448	67331	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	340164	339427	99.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	97989	97269	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32597	30980	95.0
Economically disadvantaged students	387671	385491	99.4
Migratory students	2028	1966	96.9
Male	375629	373711	99.5
Female	357978	356621	99.6
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial data: Total enrolled is 20191. Total tested is 20143.			

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	25441	26.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	65270	67.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6655	6.8
Total	97366	
<b>Comments:</b> This total number includes the Multi-racial subgroup which is not accounted for in the Student Groups provided by CSPR. This number is correct and reflects the total number tested not the total number enrolled.		

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	125317	113512	90.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	169	97.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3668	3577	97.5
Black, non-Hispanic	46942	40076	85.4
Hispanic	13179	11638	88.3
White, non-Hispanic	57270	54244	94.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17649	13193	74.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8330	6992	83.9
Economically disadvantaged students	68701	59231	86.2
Migratory students	383	334	87.2
Male	64282	57381	89.3
Female	61035	56131	92.0
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial data: Total assessed is 4084 and total proficient is 3808			
Migrant data are correct.			

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

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

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

<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	125058	106470	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	160	92.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3610	3357	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	46932	36580	77.9
Hispanic	13013	10107	77.7
White, non-Hispanic	57246	52633	91.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17656	12294	69.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8057	5654	70.2
Economically disadvantaged students	68528	53706	78.4
Migratory students	376	269	71.5
Male	64155	52836	82.4
Female	60903	53634	88.1
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial Data: Total assessed is 4083. Total proficient is 3640			
Date entered is correct.			

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

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

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

<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	120301	94670	78.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	143	124	86.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3654	3438	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	44784	30667	68.5
Hispanic	11914	8789	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	56107	48607	86.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16811	8747	52.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5878	3579	60.9
Economically disadvantaged students	64141	44822	69.9
Migratory students	359	243	67.7
Male	61380	47735	77.8
Female	58921	46935	79.7
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-Racial data: Total assessed is 3699 and total proficient is 3045.			
Data entered are correct.			

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

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

**1.3.4 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	120028	101802	84.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	143	124	86.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3580	3336	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	44769	34359	76.8
Hispanic	11743	8923	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	56099	51778	92.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	16818	11085	65.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5586	3456	61.9
Economically disadvantaged students	63958	49467	77.3
Migratory students	348	237	68.1
Male	61233	50837	83.0
Female	58795	50965	86.7
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-Racial data: Total assessed is 3694 and total proficient is 3282.			
Data entered are correct.			

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**

<b>Grade 5</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	121189	106904	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	140	90.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3666	3548	96.8
Black, non-Hispanic	45557	37336	82.0
Hispanic	11819	9974	84.4
White, non-Hispanic	56562	52794	93.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17091	11020	64.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5637	4210	74.7
Economically disadvantaged students	64678	53452	82.6
Migratory students	354	276	78.0
Male	62235	54059	86.9
Female	58954	52845	89.6
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 3431 and the total number proficient is 3112.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 5</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	120935	103552	85.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	141	91.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3593	3340	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	45547	35973	79.0
Hispanic	11656	9105	78.1
White, non-Hispanic	56556	51934	91.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17101	11164	65.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5369	3427	63.8
Economically disadvantaged students	64522	50812	78.8
Migratory students	345	229	66.4
Male	62091	51866	83.5
Female	58844	51686	87.8
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 3429 and the total number proficient is 3059.			
Data entered are correct			

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**

<b>Grade 6</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	120066	78122	65.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	165	124	75.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3478	3116	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	46617	23539	50.5
Hispanic	10947	6284	57.4
White, non-Hispanic	55717	42843	76.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15328	5128	33.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4566	1854	40.6
Economically disadvantaged students	63012	32573	51.7
Migratory students	308	143	46.4
Male	61540	39188	63.7
Female	58526	38934	66.5
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 3142 and the total number proficient is 2216.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 6</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	119814	107138	89.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	155	94.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3439	3293	95.8
Black, non-Hispanic	46604	39546	84.9
Hispanic	10762	9177	85.3
White, non-Hispanic	55703	52062	93.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15331	10570	69.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4301	3095	72.0
Economically disadvantaged students	62822	53011	84.4
Migratory students	298	219	73.5
Male	61403	52863	86.1
Female	58411	54275	92.9
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 3142 and the total number proficient is 2905.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

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

<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	121067	90182	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	148	79.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3518	3231	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	47676	29713	62.3
Hispanic	10388	7249	69.8
White, non-Hispanic	56272	47440	84.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15144	6399	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4153	2137	51.5
Economically disadvantaged students	62724	39984	63.8
Migratory students	309	198	64.1
Male	62059	44686	72.0
Female	59008	45496	77.1
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 3027 and the total number proficient is 2401.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

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

<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	120868	103007	85.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	172	92.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3474	3184	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	47690	37369	78.4
Hispanic	10223	7935	77.6
White, non-Hispanic	56267	51640	91.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15150	9041	59.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3918	2132	54.4
Economically disadvantaged students	62588	48783	77.9
Migratory students	298	200	67.1
Male	61958	50882	82.1
Female	58910	52125	88.5
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 3028 and the total number proficient is 2707.			
Data entered are correct			

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	123668	101241	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	148	127	85.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3426	3276	95.6
Black, non-Hispanic	49763	36725	73.8
Hispanic	10072	7650	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	57496	51096	88.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15145	7469	49.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3978	2345	59.0
Economically disadvantaged students	63104	46330	73.4
Migratory students	308	193	62.7
Male	62870	50132	79.7
Female	60798	51109	84.1
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 2763 and the total number proficient is 2367.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

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

<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	123476	109713	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	148	136	91.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3375	3167	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	49759	41770	83.9
Hispanic	9921	8002	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	57511	54079	94.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15155	9615	63.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3746	2208	58.9
Economically disadvantaged students	62976	52163	82.8
Migratory students	300	202	67.3
Male	62775	54375	86.6
Female	60701	55338	91.2
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial data: Total assessed is 2762 and the total number proficient is 2559.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92394	85069	92.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	149	140	94.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2983	2915	97.7
Black, non-Hispanic	34322	29608	86.3
Hispanic	4802	4320	90.0
White, non-Hispanic	48510	46567	96.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8253	4951	60.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1844	1467	79.6
Economically disadvantaged students	33932	29235	86.2
Migratory students	86	68	79.1
Male	43893	40293	91.8
Female	48501	44776	92.3
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-Racial - Total Students Tested is 1628. Total Student scoring proficient is 1519.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92327	88788	96.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	148	143	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2967	2844	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	34311	32338	94.2
Hispanic	4781	4377	91.5
White, non-Hispanic	48489	47503	98.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8239	6287	76.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1806	1336	74.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33910	31538	93.0
Migratory students	88	64	72.7
Male	43873	41738	95.1
Female	48454	47050	97.1
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-Racial - Total Students Tested is 1631. Total Student scoring proficient is 1583.			
Data entered are correct			

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

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

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	2100	1726	82.2
Districts	184	71	38.6
<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	1237	1027	83.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1048	873	83.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	189	154	81.5
<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
183	65	35.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.

Georgia's statewide system of support provides school improvement services to all schools and local education agencies (LEAs) through regional support teams. These teams are comprised of a cadre of former superintendents principals and teachers with expertise in school leadership curriculum instruction continuous school improvement and specific academic content areas such as mathematics. In addition regional support teams may request the services of outside experts based on the needs of individual schools. Georgia delivers statewide support through five (5) school improvement regions. Each region has a regional support team comprised of up to five (5) system leaders. Each system leader is assigned up to 10 LEAs. The system leader is responsible for providing professional learning continuous school improvement planning based on Georgia School Standards and student specific data unique to each LEA. In addition to system leaders each region is assigned a regional leadership facilitator whose primary responsibility is to provide professional learning in mathematics curriculum and instruction. A second regional leadership facilitator is focused on coordinating the work of and supporting programs for at-risk students. System leaders also work in collaboration with Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA) school improvement specialists to support schools that are identified for improvement and schools that did not make AYP for one year. In addition to regional leadership facilitators the GaDOE also employs school-level leadership facilitators. These facilitators are assigned to improvement corrective action and restructuring schools and provide on-site support. The level of services provided to schools depends on the number of years a school has been identified for improvement corrective action or restructuring. For schools identified for corrective action a school-level leadership facilitator is assigned to work with school-level administrators and school building leadership teams one day per week. School-level leadership facilitators provide guidance in developing continuous school improvement plans using the tools and resources developed by the GaDOE. They also provide professional learning on data utilization conduct classroom observations model classroom instruction and conduct awareness walks designed to collect formative data on classroom practices. In addition they serve as the lead on collaborative school teams established to analyze data and redesign instruction based on data. Schools identified for restructuring receive a more intense level of support. A school-level leadership facilitator is assigned to provide on-site support to schools two days per week and these schools are required to enter into a contract with the Georgia State Board of Education to meet specific improvement strategies outlined in the contract. Another on-site support expert is the contract monitor. They are responsible for monitoring the school's progress toward meeting contract milestones. In addition schools identified for restructuring receive a mandatory GAPSS. Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards (GAPSS) is a formalized process to assess schools implementation of Georgia schools standards. Georgia School Standards defines the eight strands for effective schools—Curriculum Assessment Instruction Planning and Organization Parent and Community Involvement Professional Learning Leadership and School Culture. Rubrics to assess the school's level of implementation are included for each standard to help each school identify its current performance in relation to the standard identifying strengths and determining areas for growth. In order to ensure that schools have instructional tools to address their weakness members of the school staff must participate in Raising Standards a GaDOE developed professional learning program that provides processes and strategies for teaching mathematics and English/language arts and science in a standards-based classroom. The work of School Improvement Services is focused on guiding systems and schools in the following: sustaining continuous school improvement through all strands of the Georgia school standards titled "School Keys" and increasing student achievement through the adoption implementation and tracking of high impact practices as outlined below.

1. Guide the leadership team collaborative learning teams and individual teachers in best practices that will directly lead to increased academic achievement for individual students and subgroups in relation to AYP targets. GaDOE goals (1 6 8 9)
2. Guide leaders in developing and sustaining a leadership team that is focused on continuous improvement in order to increase student achievement. GaDOE goals (2 3)
3. Guide leaders the leadership team and collaborative learning teams with the development of structures and processes that support standards-based job-embedded results-driven professional learning. GaDOE goals (1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 12)
4. Guide school leaders in creating and sustaining a culture of data-driven decision making. GaDOE goals(1 3 4 6 8 9)
5. Guide the leadership team and collaborative learning teams in creating action plans with measurable goals. GaDOE goals (1 3 6 7 8 9)
6. Guide the leadership team and collaborative learning teams with: implementing the GPS within standards-based classrooms; and monitoring the implementation of the GPS within standards-based classrooms.

GaDOE goals (1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 12)

7. Facilitate the leadership team and collaborative learning teams' development implementation and continuous monitoring of a formalized system of data-driven intervention(s). (Pyramid of Interventions)

GaDOE goals (1 4 6 8 9 11 18)

8. Assist the leadership team in continuously assessing progress toward fully-operational high impact practices. GaDOE goals (1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 18)

9. Guide leaders in sustaining the school improvement process through all strands of the Georgia School Standards in order to increase student achievement. GaDOE goals (1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 18) Additionally School Improvement Services administrators have the following responsibilities: Manage data documents and resources; Collaborate within the internal and external structures and agencies; Provide overall direction structure and leadership to the statewide system of support and processes for improvement; Provide assistance in identifying and addressing statewide issues that directly impact individual students and subgroups in relation to NCLB requirements and AYP targets; Research analyze and compile results of effectiveness of all operations; Support Leadership Facilitators and Regional Core Team as they perform their roles; Data Training Logistics and Resources; Provide clear vertical communication channel(s) and information to School Improvement field-based staff; Support and monitor the work of School Improvement Services; The School Improvement Division utilizes web and print media to publish high quality tools and resources that include the following: A boxed set of resources titled "School Keys: Unlocking Continuous Improvement" which encompasses the following: The school standards titled "School Keys: Unlocking Excellence through the Georgia School Standards"; The "GAPSS Analysis: Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards: Closing the Gap" The Implementation Resource: Building Capacity through Best Practices; The Graduation Counts! Guide; The Graduation Counts! Guide DVD professional learning series; The School Improvement Fieldbook: A Guide to Advancing Student Achievement in Georgia Schools; The System Improvement Fieldbook: A Guide to Advancing Student Achievement in Georgia School Systems; The Data Utilization Guide: A Resource for Georgia Educators; Teachers-As-Advisors 10 Step process DVD professional learning series.

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.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	7
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	9
Replacement of the principal	11
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	14
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	13
<b>Comments:</b> School take overs are unconstitutional in the state of Georgia.	

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.

Due to the fact the school districts' needs improvement status ultimately hinges on the status of the schools within the school district all of the school improvement resources services and structures identified in 1.4.3.2. that are directed to and are available to schools provide assistance to school districts as well. Additionally for the 26 school districts in Georgia that have been identified for improvement (none have been identified for corrective action) district-level services are provided through the five School Improvement Regional Support Teams.

These services revolve around the contents of the System Improvement Fieldbook and the Data Utilization Guide and include assistance and resources in district-level school improvement planning data utilization and system level plan implementation. Some systems have adopted the "School Keys: Unlocking Continuous Improvement" as a system level initiative and have been trained in conducting system led "internal" GAPSS (school performance audits). Services also include capacity building in school districts to enable the school districts to provide services to identified improvement corrective action and restructuring schools within 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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> There are no systems in district corrective action. We also do not provide additional school improvement funds to systems that are in needs improvement at this time. All federal school improvement funds are distributed to schools.	

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.

	<b>Districts</b>	<b>Schools</b>
Final AYP and identification determinations	09/14/07	09/14/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	07/08/07	07/08/07
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	57	5
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	08/31/07
---	----------

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.

Title I School improvement funds are provided to school systems based on the schools in needs improvement and their specific NI level.
--

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	149
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	141
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	144507
Who applied to transfer	5573
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	4558

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0
<b>Comments:</b> We did not collect this information this year.	

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.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	34
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	141
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	83923
Who applied for supplemental educational services	14009
Who received supplemental educational services	10564
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	\$ 9281932
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	268486	258394	96.2	10092	3.8
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	22582	21293	94.3	1289	5.7
Low-poverty schools	22617	22196	98.1	421	1.9
All elementary schools	83106	80706	97.1	2400	2.9
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	22836	20904	91.5	1932	8.5
Low-poverty schools	62800	61539	98.0	1261	2.0
All secondary schools	185380	177688	95.9	7692	4.1
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Self-contained elementary classes are counted such that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one "class". Departmentalized courses are counted such that each classroom is counted as a 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	34.0
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	16.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	50.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	52.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	75.2	36.9
Poverty metric used	Percent free/reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	56.5	36.8
Poverty metric used	Percent free/reduced lunch.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.ncela.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			
81	Sheltered English instruction			
	Structured English immersion			
2	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
42	Content-based ESL			
81	Pull-out ESL			
38	Other (explain)			
<b>Comments:</b> "Other" type of instruction educational programs used by subgrantees for instructing ELL students are ESOL Lab/Resource Center Push-In model and Co-Teaching.				

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.	57101
<b>Comments:</b> Total number of LEP students enrolled K-12 this reporting year is 83086	

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

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

**1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	105436
Vietnamese	5704
Korean	5328
Other African	3378
Other European	2914

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

<b>Comments:</b> Chinese 2763
Other Indian 2665
Other Asian 2565
French 1622

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

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

#### 1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

##### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

##### Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

<b>ALL LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	65179
Not tested/State annual ELP	17907
Subtotal	83086
LEP/One Data Point	26379
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.6.3.1.2 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.

<b>Title III LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	55711
Not tested/State annual ELP	1390
Subtotal	57101
LEP/One Data Point	20583
<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 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	47.0	14235	53.3	Y
No progress		12454		
ELP attainment	5.0	4026	6.9	Y
<b>Comments:</b>				

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>				

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

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

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

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

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

**1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility**

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

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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



**1.6.3.4.3 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	16264
MFLEP/AYP grades	9537
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	34079
LEP HS/Non-AYP	7382
LEP other grades	125
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

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

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> Georgia does not assess LEP students in any language other than English.	

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> Georgia does not assess LEP students in any language other than English.	

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> Georgia does not assess LEP students in any language other than English.	

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> Georgia does not assess LEP students in any language other than English.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* 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> Georgia does not assess LEP students in any language other than English.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* 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.

<b># Year One</b>	<b># Year Two</b>	<b>Total</b>
6985	9279	16264
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.6.3.6.2 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
9457	7796	82.4	1661

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9527	8124	85.3	1403

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

**Comments:**

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

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

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance** (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	81
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	19
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	18
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	10
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	8
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	9
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	8
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b> Note: Not all subgrantees met the minimum group size to give the ELL population an AYP determination so the number of subgrantees by number of AMAOs met will not sum to the total number of subgrantees.	

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

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

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

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</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
34465	24899	88

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.	1827
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.	1827
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*.	915

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	81	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	81	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	81	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	81	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	81	
Other (Explain in comment box)	27	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	81	9603
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	81	1827
PD provided to principals	81	1640
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	81	821
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	81	634
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	81	215
Total		14740
<b>Comments:</b> Select subgrantees offer online ESOL endorsement training through distant learning techniques and use of Ipods.		

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

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

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

##### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	07/16/07	15
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

#### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The present process is providing funds to the subgrantees in a timely manner. Georgia will continue seeking alternative methods to further shorten this time to 15 days or less.
--

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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
All Students	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	62.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	63.6
Hispanic	55.7
White, non-Hispanic	76.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	32.4
Limited English proficient	39.5
Economically disadvantaged	61.5
Migratory students	32.3
Male	67.0
Female	74.5
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	4.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4.3
Hispanic	5.0
White, non-Hispanic	4.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5.8
Limited English proficient	5.1
Economically disadvantaged	4.7
Migratory students	6.6
Male	4.9
Female	3.4
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	157	157
LEAs with subgrants	23	23
Total	180	180
<b>Comments:</b> Note# 1:  The GaDOE had a total of 24 subgrantees. One subgrantee DeKalb Public Library did not have access to the Student Information System (SIS) and therefore was not able to report student data.		
Note# 2:  All LEAs (both subgrantees and non-grantees) submitted the GaDOE Homeless Survey information.		
Note# 3:  LEAs not reporting through the GaDOE Student Information System (SIS) reported data directly to the GaDOE through the Homeless Survey on the LEA Consolidated Application.		

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

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

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	73	103
K	588	925
1	641	834
2	569	785
3	587	731
4	474	661
5	469	767
6	358	701
7	347	724
8	383	710
9	350	647
10	227	422
11	172	305
12	178	286
Ungraded	0	0
Total	5416	8601

**Comments:** This information was received from the GaDOE Student Information System (SIS) report. LEAs not reporting through the GaDOE Student Information System (SIS) reported data directly to the GaDOE through the Homeless Survey on the LEA Consolidated Application.

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

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

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

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	8633	4869
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	17652	8959
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	143	40
Hotels/Motels	3052	1548
Total	29480	15416

**Comments:** This information was received from the GaDOE annual Homeless survey on the LEA Consolidated Application.

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)	103
K	925
1	834
2	785
3	731
4	661
5	767
6	701
7	724
8	710
9	647
10	422
11	305
12	286
Ungraded	0
Total	8601

**Comments:** This information was received from the GaDOE Student Information System (SIS) report. LEAs not reporting through the GaDOE Student Information System (SIS) reported data directly to the GaDOE through the Homeless Survey on the LEA Consolidated Application.

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	846
Migratory children/youth	494
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2177
Limit English proficient students	1122

**Comments: Unaccompanied youth and Migratory children and youth data was received from the GaDOE annual Homeless survey.**

**Children with disabilities (IDEA) and Limited English proficient students data was received from SIS data.**

**LEAs not reporting through the GaDOE Student Information System (SIS) reported data directly to the GaDOE through the Homeless Survey on the LEA Consolidated Application.**

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	23
2. Expedited evaluations	17
3. Staff professional development and awareness	20
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	20
5. Transportation	20
6. Early childhood programs	18
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	21
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	23
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	23
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	20
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	22
12. Counseling	21
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	17
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
15. School supplies	23
16. Referral to other programs and services	22
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	20
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
<b>Comments:</b> This information was received from the GaDOE annual Homeless survey on the LEA Consolidated Application.	

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	16
2. School Selection	0
3. Transportation	16
4. School records	16
5. Immunizations	16
6. Other medical records	16
7. Other Barriers	16
<b>Comments:</b> This information was received from the GaDOE subgrantee's Annual Evaluation Report submitted in May 2007.	
The GaDOE 2006-2007 Homeless data collection did not request information on barriers. This will be added to the survey for the June 2008 submission.	

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	697	474
4	600	425
5	716	502
6	651	514
7	663	449
8	635	482
High School	265	241

**Comments:** 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.

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	702	545
4	612	375
5	718	551
6	653	297
7	670	362
8	643	398
High School	269	219

**Comments:** 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.

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)	1373
K	311
1	598
2	517
3	521
4	479
5	406
6	435
7	384
8	393
9	399
10	282
11	159
12	124
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	4604
Total	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

The decrease is less than 10%.

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)	118
K	168
1	155
2	156
3	118
4	121
5	103
6	70
7	69
8	63
9	37
10	24
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	<N
Total	1216
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

The state is reporting a decrease greater than 10% in the number of students in the category 2 count because of generally lower eligible Pre K-12 student numbers present in the state during the summer 2007 term. Also mobility patterns for migrant summer work are no longer as certain as historically they had been in the state. This fact makes it more challenging to be able to anticipate migrant support service needs during the summer term.

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.

COEstar was used to compile and generate the category 1 and category 2 child counts for this reporting period. The child counts for the last reporting period were also generated using the COEstar system.

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.

Note: This information pertains to both the category 1 and category 2 counts.

Upon enrollment in the Migrant Education Program (MEP) information from the Data Entry Form (DEF) is entered onto the electronic Certificate of Eligibility

(COE) in COEstar. Data on the DEF includes:

- (1) Family data (parent/guardian name(s) family language current address and home base)
- (2) Child data (name sex race date of birth birthplace school grade and school enrollment date)
- (3) Eligibility data (where moved from where moved to with/to join or on his/her own move date of move qualifying worker qualifying activity employer whether work is seasonal or temporary whether work is agricultural or fishing related whether work is principle means of livelihood)
- (4) Residency date
- (5) Comments explaining migrant work history and qualifying activity as identified in eligibility section
- (6) Other data (previous school enrollments etc.)
- (7) Parent/Guardian and recruiter signatures

All of the above information is obtained through a face-to-face interview with the family generally at the residence or workplace by a trained Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) recruiter or a trained local education agency (LEA) migrant staff person. Occasionally the family interview occurs when parents come to the school to register their children. In all cases the DEF is completed and submitted to the appropriate regional GaDOE Migrant Education Agency (MEA) office for processing.

DEFs are completed on each new family/self-eligible youth identified by the recruiter or LEA staff during the initial interview. Identification & recruitment (ID & R) activities are carried out year round. Occasionally ID & R activities are conducted as a part of other MEA activities e.g. summer festivals migrant health fairs.

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.

The GaDOE employs a single full time MEP state data collections coordinator. The primary responsibility of this individual is to monitor/maintain the statewide data system update the data in COEstar and generate reports as requested by the state education agency. Each week the data specialists from each of the four regional MEA offices send electronic copies of their COEstar database to the state data collections coordinator. (Each regional MEA office has a complete statewide copy of the COEstar database.) The state data collections coordinator synchronizes each copy running checks to catch any duplication errors and/or missing data. If problems with the data are detected the state data collections coordinator sends an e-mail to the appropriate data specialist the appropriate regional MEA office coordinator and the state MEP director explaining the problem. When the regional data specialist has corrected the problem she sends an e-mail with the corrections to inform the state data collections coordinator the state MEP director and the regional office coordinator that the problematic data have been researched and corrected. When this review process is complete the state data collections coordinator then uploads an updated corrected copy of the COEstar database to each regional data specialist.

Because each regional MEA office and the state data collections coordinator have complete copies of the COEstar database many errors and duplicates are caught at the regional level. Each month the state data collections coordinator prepares a performance report to provide an overview of every aspect of the COEstar database for the state MEP director. If the state MEP director sees any problems these are communicated by e-mail to the state data collections coordinator for resolution.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for both counts were collected and maintained using the same set of procedures.

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 Georgia MEP uses the following processes to calculate each child count:

• 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);

Response: COEstar is programmed to produce a count based on all the eligibility criteria contained in the federal statute.

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

Response: TROMIK's Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided 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 Assessment and Graduation / Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this 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.

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

Response: Each summer or intersession term the local project director forwards a report to the regional MEA office containing the number of eligible migrant children or youth who received services instructional or support at least one day during the summer or intersession term. The data regarding the particulars of the services are entered into the individual student's information/school history line in COEstar.

• children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

Response: The state data collections coordinator runs COEstar's Performance Reporter which has a number of programmed interventions to count migrant children only once statewide for the period specified in the state data collections coordinator query. Some of these interventions include checking names that are the same or similar the maiden name of the child's mother the date and place of birth the QAD etc..

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 count was generated using the same system as the category 1 count.

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.

It is the goal of the Georgia MEP to achieve and maintain 100% accuracy in its eligibility identification and recruiting processes. Important quality control steps and processes have been implemented to improve the SEA's ability to ensure and verify the accuracy of eligibility determinations prior to or immediately after entering eligibility information in the COEstar system. They are:

#### Ongoing Recruiter Training-

Recruiters are provided mandatory training throughout the year. They attend in-service training on:

- The Migrant Education Program
- The role of recruitment
- How to apply the eligibility section of the Non-Regulatory Guidance
- How to resolve difficult recruitment cases
- How to conduct interviews
- How to fill out a DEF
- The Georgia Identification and Recruitment Handbook, which includes written eligibility guidance
- Effective recruitment techniques
- Records maintenance/documentation

All program staff members involved in recruitment including LEA funded staff are required to attend these training sessions. Staff is required to pass a series of assessments to certify their understanding of the state's recruiting policies and guidelines. Passing scores are mandatory in order to receive a satisfactory annual evaluation from program administrators. All full time state recruiters are required to meet at least once every quarter with the state ID & R coordinator to review any change in guidelines discuss policies procedures and to resolve difficult or ambiguous recruitment cases. All newly hired recruiting staff both state and LEA participates in an initial three day recruitment training session prior to beginning any recruitment effort for the state. New recruiters also have all paperwork fully screened by an experienced recruiter until they successfully complete ten enrollments with no errors requiring follow up with the families.

#### Data Entry Form (DEF) Processing-

Statewide uniformity in processing DEFs for data system entry is as follows:

- Recruiters recruit families or youth by completing a DEF in a face-to-face interview.
- Written information recorded during the interview is verbally reviewed by the recruiter for accuracy. The recruiter then signs the form and asks the interviewee to sign as well.
- The pink copy is immediately given to the interviewee as a record of the initial eligibility interview.
- The original (white copy) along with the LEA copy (yellow) goes to the regional MEA office data specialist.
- The DEF is date stamped upon arrival at the regional office.
- The data specialist reviews the DEF for completion to ensure that all boxes are marked and that the DEF is filled out according to the state's completion instructions as described in the Georgia ID & R Handbook (2007 Revised Edition).
- If the DEF meets all of the necessary criteria the data specialist initials it in the top right hand corner. It is then given to the

regional MEA office coordinator for final review and approval.

â€¢ If the data specialist sees that an item is missing or believes that an item needs clarification she records the date and concern (s) in a log retains a copy of the DEF and returns the original white and yellow copy to the recruiter who conducted the interview. The request is made in writing that the recruiter correct and/or provide additional comments or corrections. The recruiter is required to go back to the family for any additional information influencing the eligibility determination and both must initial the changes on the form. A data specialist can correct and initial spelling mistakes without having to notify the recruiter or family/youth.

â€¢ As mentioned the data specialist maintains a list of concerns that are encountered and the name of the recruiter submitting the DEF in question. This assists in monitoring errors as they arise. The regional MEA office is responsible for (1) resolving outstanding issues/discrepancies and (2) providing feedback and training to individual recruiters as the need arises.

â€¢ All DEFs receive regional MEA office coordinator verification and approval prior to being entered into the COEstar system. A signature line is included on the original and yellow copy of the DEF for this purpose.

â€¢ After errors and discrepancies are resolved the information on the DEF is entered into the COEstar system where an electronic certificate of eligibility (COE) is generated.

â€¢ The original DEF and the electronic COE are maintained at the regional office.

â€¢ The yellow copy is sent to the original interviewer.

â€¢ A COEstar generated notification or "friendly COE" form is mailed to the LEA to provide systems with basic program eligibility information.

The data specialists and recruiters work as a team. They consult with each other to resolve eligibility issues and answer questions that may arise in the initial eligibility review process. If there are eligibility issues that the data specialists and recruiters are unable to resolve independently they will consult with the regional MEA office coordinators immediately to resolve the issues. Any initial eligibility issues which the regional offices are unable to resolve independently are referred to the state ID & R coordinator. If at any time the ID & R coordinator is unable to answer the question it is referred to the state or Migrant Education Office within the United States Department of Education in Washington DC for assistance.

Should a question arise from any source regarding an eligibility determination made on a child, the state takes action on the question or concern by requesting that a re-interview be completed. The form that is utilized is the same as that used in the random sample rolling re-interview process and is available from each MEA data specialist. The process for evaluating the eligibility determination follows that of the rolling re-interview process.

The state, itself, is solely responsible for reviewing and monitoring the quality of its migrant student eligibility documentation as it relates to the annual child count, including student eligibility data related to attendance in regular year and summer/intersession projects. All eligibility decisions are finalized and made by the coordinator in each of the state's regional MEA offices prior to the delivery of any MEP services. Every child's eligibility documentation is included for selection in the random sample process associated with the quality control efforts of the state's rolling re-interviews.

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.

Rolling Re-Interview Process (Monthly Quality Control) for the Reporting Period:

Paperwork preparation and staff assignment for monthly quality control (MQC) process-

1. On the first working day of each month during the reporting period the four regional MEA office data specialists run queries generating a list of COEs entered into the COEstar system the month before.

2. The data specialists determine the random sample size required for the month either 5% or 10 COEs whichever is greater. The random selection is done following a random sampling protocol established by the state data collections coordinator. More than the required amount is pulled to allow for substitutions due to moves or the inability to locate interviewees. Guidance is in place in the event that a region does not generate at least 10 COEs during a given month and/or to address issues of high migrant mobility that may cause the re-interview staff to exceed reasonable levels of effort in completing the task.

3. The completed MQC for any given month does not exceed 20 verified COEs in each region.
4. The regional coordinator chooses the most appropriate reviewer for the verification of eligibility re-interview. It is expected that the verification will be done by a trained reviewer different than the original interviewer.
5. The data specialist maintains a log of who is in charge of completing the verification of each COE for the regional office and distributes the paperwork for completion.

#### Conducting the verification process in the field-

1. All verification of eligibility is expected to be done through a face-to-face re-interview with the original interviewee. The reviewer completing the verification of eligibility may only place phone calls to set up appointments.
2. On the day of the verification the reviewer has the option of being accompanied by another recruiter or LEA staff member but not by the same person who originally interviewed and signed the family.
3. The reviewer doing the verification explains in a positive manner the reason why the quality control measure is taking place.
4. If it is determined that a family has departed the reviewer documents who provided the information using a comment such as "Departed per aunt neighbor etc.." The interviewer signs and dates the certification form and moves to the next COE from the random sample.
5. If the reviewer finds an interviewee not at home he or she makes at least three more attempts to locate or meet with the individual before moving to the next COE from the random sample. Each try takes place at different dates and hours of the day and each one is documented in the top section of the verification form. After the third try the reviewer circles the last visit documentation notation. The reviewer then enters a comment such as "3 attempts-unable to locate" on the space provided for the parent's signature. The reviewer then signs and dates the verification form.
6. When conducting the verification the reviewer is free to paraphrase any of the questions in order to clarify the meaning of a question for the family but may not use any leading questions.
7. The original DEF is available only to help the reviewer to organize his/her thoughts and understand the eligibility decision prior to the interview. The reviewer understands that he/she may not refer to previously recorded facts or show the DEF to the family.
8. At the end of the visit the reviewer verbally reviews the data entered on the verification form with the interviewee and dates the verification form. The interviewee is then asked to sign the form along with the reviewer.
9. If the interviewee is unable to write or sign an appropriate mark of some kind may take the place of the signature.
10. If the interviewee refuses to sign the reviewer makes a notation of it along with the reason if any reason is given. The lack of a signature has no impact on eligibility or ineligibility and the verification result is still considered valid.
11. The reviewer in charge of the eligibility verification has until the end of the month to deliver the completed forms to the respective regional MEA coordinator for review and approval.

#### Completing Final Paperwork-

1. The data specialist uses an electronic spreadsheet for her region contained within the state's "Monthly Quality Control" Excel document to enter the final results of the re-interviews.
2. Information is entered for each randomly selected COE used during the monthly quality control process whether the verification attempt was successful or not. Any questionable cases or petitions for reexamination are handled by following a protocol established by the state identification and recruitment coordinator.
3. The final Excel document is sent as an electronic attachment to the state identification and recruitment coordinator and the state data collections coordinator by the first Friday of the following month.
4. The regional MEA coordinator compiles a folder that contains the following completed documents:
  - A hard copy of the "Monthly Quality Control" Excel document serving as the cover page
  - Each of the verified DEFs attached to the back of their respective "Verification of Migrant Child/Youth Program Eligibility" forms

-Each verification form is numbered in the top right corner in the order in which they were entered in the electronic spreadsheet

5. Copies of the DEFs and the verification forms are mailed to the state identification and recruitment coordinator in Brooklet as well no later than seven working days after the end of the month.

6. The original folder is filed and available for audit at each regional MEA office.

7. The regional MEA coordinator takes immediate and appropriate action facilitating data corrections for any misidentified children or families.

8. The data specialist prepares the letters to notify any misidentified families by mail by the beginning of the second week of the following month.

9. The data specialist notifies the appropriate school districts in writing of the misidentified families with a request to remove migrant coding and cease services immediately.

10. The state data collections coordinator removes the misidentified children from the COEstar database using information from the Excel document and the regional offices receive the corrected database through the weekly transfer of information. Misidentified children's information is never permanently erased.

For this reporting period, 984 eligibility re-interviews were attempted to reach the state's random sample requirement of 507. 441 were successfully completed, and 428 (97.05%) were found eligible. The state was able to conduct re-interviews on only 441 out of 984 children initially sampled because of high mobility rates (departures) within the sample and/or an inability to find the required interviewee at home after making three separate attempts at different times of the day (see section 5).

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.

At the beginning of each school year each child enrolled in the previous school year is "resigned". This means each family is contacted existing data are verified and updated information is secured. A new COE is not created unless there has been a new qualifying move. The previous COE is recertified with any updated information or necessary corrections.

As previously mentioned the state began conducting monthly random samplings of newly identified students in each of its four regional areas in February 2006. The sampling size has been equal to 5% of the region's previous month's recruitment or at least 10 families but no more than 20. This process has significantly helped to ensure that child count data are reported and maintained accurately.

At the same time the state also put in place a request for eligibility re-certification process that allows any individual with a legitimate concern regarding a child's eligibility for MEP services to petition for an eligibility re-certification on the child. Cases are handled by staff from the regional MEA offices following the same procedures and protocol established for conducting the monthly random samplings.

In addition to a random sample re-interview at any time during the year and based upon the COE stored in COEstar a verification of eligibility and data accuracy is relatively simple. The qualifying arrival date (QAD) listed on the COE is tested for the eligibility 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 he or she can be counted for funding/services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). Examples of additional checks include a comparison of like or nearly like names by looking at other demographic data such as birth date grade gender mother's maiden name etc..

By virtue of the completion of the extensive data collection and review process described previously and the entering of data into COEstar to generate an electronic COE each regional MEA office is doing its best to assure that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible and in compliance with the laws and regulations. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.

COEstar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system in order to maintain an audit track but it does provide the means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.

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.

COEstar is a separate but at the same time integrated component of Georgia's student data collection system with appropriate checks and balances performed in an ongoing manner annually. Each spring the LEAs must match their migrant coding to the COEstar system. This helps to check for errors. In addition the COEstar Performance Reporter is run monthly to be sent to the state MEP director for review. The report generated is intended to catch obvious errors continuously throughout the program year rather than waiting until the end of the year.

As a final check for accuracy the state MEP director is provided the data gleaned by the Performance Reporter in an Excel workbook covering the entire program year. The state MEP director reviews the data provided looking for anomalies and areas of confusion and/or contradictory data. When errors or problems are noted immediate consultation with the state data collections coordinator TROMIK (COEstar provider) and regional office data specialists is initiated by the state director for explanation review and correction until the information is considered to be as correct as possible.

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.

Since beginning the rolling re-interview process in February 2006 and at the conclusion of each month's work a plan is established by the state to address, through corrective actions and improvements, any issues that led to any incorrect eligibility determinations uncovered during the previous month's re-interviews. Such plans are documented in the state's monthly re-interview quality control summary report.

During the reporting period 9/1/06 to 8/31/07, the state identified 13 (2.95%) children out of 441 whose re-interview information led to the conclusion that they were ineligible for program services. The reasons for changing the eligibility status of these 13 children were: non-qualifying work, primary intention of the move other than qualifying work, child born after the QAD, "to join" move beyond a year, overage child, graduated child, permanent work, QAD over three years at the moment of signing, temporary work where the family intended to remain longer than twelve months.

The following is a summary of the corrective actions taken as a result of the rolling re-interview process during this reporting period:

All recruiters at fault were contacted and re-training was delivered on all aspects of eligibility with special emphasis placed on the problematic areas. Additionally, training covering the problematic points discovered during the re-interviews was designed and integrated into one or more of the three mandatory trainings that all recruiters receive during the year.

The state will continue to refine and improve the monthly eligibility determination review process that is in place as areas of weakness are identified.

The state will also continue to strengthen its recruiter certification and training process. Overall however the state does feel proud of the accomplishments and significant improvements made over the past three years in assuring the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

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.

It is believed that the child counts being reported are accurate and are based on an eligibility determination process that is well structured and sound.

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

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