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

SOUTH CAROLINA

NoChild
LeftBehind

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:

o Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*

o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*

o Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*

o Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*

o Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*

o Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*

o Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*

o Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*

o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*

o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*

o Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*

o Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*

o Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*

o Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*

o 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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
   __X__Part I, 2006-07   ___Part II, 2006-07

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
South Carolina Department of Education

Address:
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Nancy W. Busbee, Ph.D.

Telephone: 803-734-8105

Fax: 803-734-3290

e-mail: nbusbee@ed.sc.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Jim Rex, Superintendent

_____   __Wednesday, April 23, 2008, 12:49:06 PM__
   Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

NoChild
LeftBehind

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.

The mathematics academic standards were revised in 2006, with final approval of the State Board of Education in February 2007. The protocol used to guide the writing team's work may be found on the Office of Academic Standards' Web site:

http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/cso/documents/ProcedureforCyclicalReviewofAcademicStandards.pdf

The English Language Arts academic standards were revised in 2006, with the State Board of Education requesting that the Office of Academic Standards conduct a review of the standards during 2007, soliciting feedback from classroom teachers. The State Board expects to adopt the ELA academic standards in spring 2008.

The science academic standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in November 2005, with support materials made available to teachers during the 2006-07 school year.

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 <u>not</u> made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state plans to revise the mathematics and reading/language arts assessments for grades 3 - 8. The new assessments will be administered for the first time in spring 2009. Details about revisions have not been finalized.

The state has revised the mathematics and reading/language arts alternate assessments for grades 3 - 8 and high school. The new alternate assessment system (SC-Alt) was administered for the first time in spring 2007. The SC-Alt is a selected-response assessment based on alternate achievement standards linked to grade level academic standards. This system replaced the PACT-Alt and HSAP-Alt assessments.

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 <u>not</u> 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.

The state will conduct standard setting for the new assessments, but details are not final. Achievement standards were set for SC-Alt in the summer of 2007 using the Item Descriptor (ID) Matching standard setting process. The standards were applied to the spring 2007 administration.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state's science assessments were administered in grades 3 - 8 from spring 2003 to spring 2006. The science tests were administered statewide in grades 4 and 7 only in spring 2007. Changes are not anticipated.

Currently, the highest level required science course is physical science. The high school physical science assessments were administered for the first time during the 2004 - 05 school year.

Biology will soon become the highest level required science course. New biology standards were adopted in 2005. The state will field test biology items in spring 2008. The physical science assessment will be replaced with the biology assessment in fall 2009.

The state has revised the science alternate assessment for grades 3 - 8 and high school. The new alternate assessment system (SC-Alt) was administered for the first time in spring 2007. The SC-Alt is a selected-response assessment based on alternate achievement standards linked to grade level academic standards. This replaced the PACT-Alt and HSAP-Alt assessments.

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.

The standards for the current science tests were in place for the initial administrations.

Standards were set for SC-Alt in the summer of 2007 using the Item Descriptor (ID) Matching standard setting process. The standards were applied to the spring 2007 administration.

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: # Students Enrolled #Students Tested

All Students 366,279 364,472

American Indian/Alaska Native 1,199 1,192

Asian/Pac. Islander 4,821 4,805

Black/Non-Hispanic 144,177 143,295

Hispanic 16,072 15,948

White/Non-Hispanic 198,819 198,074

Children w/Disabilities 51,873 51,207

LEP 13,794 13,794

Economically Disadvantaged 194,569 193,414

Migratory Students 405 403

Male 187,364 186,249

Female 178,915 178,250

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		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
Comments: # w/Disab Tested Reg Assess w/o Accom. 20,387 Reg Assess. w/Accom. 28,496 Alt. Asses-Grade Level Stand NA Alt. Asses-Modifed Standards NA Alt. Asses-Alt. Standards 2,324 Total 51,207		

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: # Enrolled # Tested

All 366,328 363,517

Amer. Indian/Alaska Native 1,999 1,190

Asian/Pac. Islander 4,822 4,697

Black/Non-Hispanic 144,198 143,147

Hispanic 16,075 15,398

White/Non-Hispanic 198,842 197,935

Child. w/Disabilities 51,881 51,053

LEP 13,798 13,329

Econ. Disadvantaged 194,600 192,738

Migratory 405 390

Male 187,398 185,692

Female 178,930 177,826

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		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
Comments: # Tested Reg Assess 21,870 Reg Assess w/Accom. 26,854 Alt. Asses-Grade Level Standards 2,329		

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 <u>not</u> include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52182	24765	47.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	90	45.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	728	501	68.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20064	5823	29.0
Hispanic	2742	963	35.1
White, non-Hispanic	28225	17271	61.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8255	1963	23.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2642	951	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	29436	9994	34.0
Migratory students	101	26	25.7
Male	26820	12255	45.7
Female	25362	12510	49.3
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51950	33319	64.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	128	65.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	709	581	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20003	9875	49.4
Hispanic	2641	1321	50.0
White, non-Hispanic	28180	21259	75.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8200	2797	34.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2512	1250	49.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29271	15206	51.9
Migratory students	99	39	39.4
Male	26677	15537	58.2
Female	25273	17782	70.4
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51172	27059	52.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	95	51.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	715	542	75.8
Black, non-Hispanic	19637	6502	33.1
Hispanic	2508	1052	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	27959	18774	67.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7672	1907	24.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2472	1058	42.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28174	10854	38.5
Migratory students	84	26	31.0
Male	26354	14108	53.5
Female	24818	12951	52.2
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50934	27151	53.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	97	52.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	687	497	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	19587	7171	36.6
Hispanic	2395	948	39.6
White, non-Hispanic	27918	18345	65.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7625	1618	21.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2313	882	38.1
Economically disadvantaged students	28004	10846	38.7
Migratory students	81	22	27.2
Male	26207	12639	48.2
Female	24727	14512	58.7
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50954	24685	48.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	76	49.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	686	489	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	19323	5605	29.0
Hispanic	2349	918	39.1
White, non-Hispanic	28263	17505	61.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7238	1376	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2143	795	37.1
Economically disadvantaged students	27517	9318	33.9
Migratory students	70	16	22.9
Male	26237	12565	47.9
Female	24717	12120	49.0
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50768	22796	44.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	64	41.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	667	448	67.2
Black, non-Hispanic	19298	5197	26.9
Hispanic	2245	748	33.3
White, non-Hispanic	28230	16248	57.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7198	952	13.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2009	588	29.3
Economically disadvantaged students	27385	8138	29.7
Migratory students	68	12	17.6
Male	26128	9888	37.8
Female	24640	12908	52.4
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52188	25870	49.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	87	44.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	703	519	73.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20650	6528	31.6
Hispanic	2352	991	42.1
White, non-Hispanic	28104	17636	62.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7252	1123	15.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2086	843	40.4
Economically disadvantaged students	28490	10070	35.3
Migratory students	46	15	32.6
Male	27057	12716	47.0
Female	25131	13154	52.3
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	52063	22220	42.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	70	35.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	685	453	66.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20644	5634	27.3
Hispanic	2262	708	31.3
White, non-Hispanic	28100	15262	54.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7249	717	9.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1969	556	28.2
Economically disadvantaged students	28415	7968	28.0
Migratory students	43	12	27.9
Male	26988	9454	35.0
Female	25075	12766	50.9
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	53264	23043	43.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	74	46.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	671	476	70.9
Black, non-Hispanic	21463	5161	24.0
Hispanic	2166	711	32.8
White, non-Hispanic	28643	16534	57.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7314	840	11.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1838	547	29.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28610	7910	27.6
Migratory students	40	<N	
Male	27419	11630	42.4
Female	25845	11413	44.2
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	53135	19543	36.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	59	36.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	656	405	61.7
Black, non-Hispanic	21455	4506	21.0
Hispanic	2087	555	26.6
White, non-Hispanic	28623	13942	48.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7304	503	6.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1731	380	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	28521	6254	21.9
Migratory students	37	<N	
Male	27352	8066	29.5
Female	25783	11477	44.5
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	53727	14912	27.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	156	36	23.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	631	362	57.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21781	2718	12.5
Hispanic	2145	439	20.5
White, non-Hispanic	28886	11323	39.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7100	384	5.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1684	292	17.3
Economically disadvantaged students	28083	4140	14.7
Migratory students	27	<N	
Male	27065	7522	27.8
Female	26662	7390	27.7
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	53615	18513	34.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	43	27.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	621	367	59.1
Black, non-Hispanic	21760	4186	19.2
Hispanic	2076	491	23.7
White, non-Hispanic	28882	13384	46.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7086	430	6.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1598	278	17.4
Economically disadvantaged students	28008	5646	20.2
Migratory students	27	<N	
Male	27006	7343	27.2
Female	26609	11170	42.0
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50965	31364	61.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	144	86	59.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	672	524	78.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20366	8976	44.1
Hispanic	1685	779	46.2
White, non-Hispanic	28727	20915	72.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6361	1301	20.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1187	376	31.7
Economically disadvantaged students	23092	10668	46.2
Migratory students	35	16	45.7
Male	25283	15372	60.8
Female	25708	15992	62.2
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51032	35763	70.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	144	110	76.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	673	494	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	203889	11353	5.6
Hispanic	1692	802	47.4
White, non-Hispanic	27994	22908	81.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6377	1587	24.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1195	303	25.4
Economically disadvantaged students	23122	12748	55.1
Migratory students	35	12	34.3
Male	25217	16665	66.1
Female	25712	19098	74.3
Comments: Data has been verified.			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools			
Districts			
Comments: Total # # Made AYP Schools 1,130 419 Districts 85 0			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> 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			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			
Comments: # Title I Schools # Title I Made AYP All Title I 500 213 Schoolwide 488 205 Targeted Assistance 12 8			

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

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
85	0	0.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

---

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School improvement guidelines require the newly identified schools to utilize a planning process to involve stakeholders in developing a school improvement plan targeted toward the areas leading to its identification. The plan is subject to peer review and must be accepted by the LEA prior to submission to the Office of Federal and State Accountability. The plan should be fully implemented by the beginning of the next school year and should include strategies and activities based on a needs assessment process. The plan encompasses a two year time span. As part of this process, districts may receive school improvement grant allocations and are provided flexibility in funding and professional development choices to individual schools. The office of Federal and State Accountability provides technical assistance and support through its monitoring process. External providers and state department personnel may assist with programmatic, assessment and professional development activities. The schools in improvement status must utilize the plan in the second year as outlined. State School improvement allocations are determined for individual schools at the district level and technical assistance efforts continue in this stage of improvement.

The schools in corrective action must notify the Office of Federal and State Accountability of the identified action selected to target the school's areas of need. The office provides assistance through its monitoring efforts to ensure school accountability. The Title I plan reflects strategies designed to implement the reforms necessary to increase student achievement. The state may provide additional funds for district determination for Corrective Action schools identified for technical assistance with the LEA option for selection of personnel such as External Review Liaisons, Teacher Specialists, Principal leaders, specialists and mentors or financial backing for district or school based initiatives. Utilizing community and parental resources is also expected throughout the planning and implementation process.

The schools in restructuring must develop an alternative governance plan to submit to the Office of Federal and State Accountability. The schools seek input from stakeholders and conduct meetings to examine data and resources through a planning process in order to select an action. The office again provides assistance through its monitoring efforts to ensure school accountability. The Title I plan also reflects strategies that complement the restructuring efforts and highlight the more rigorous reforms required to increase student achievement. The state may provide additional funds for district determination for restructuring schools in order that they may utilize the services of external providers, state department personnel, External Review Liaisons, Teacher specialists, Principal leaders, specialists and mentors or state financial incentives for district or school based initiatives. Utilizing community and parental resources is also expected throughout the planning and implementation process.

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

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

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[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

---

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

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

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts identified in improvement are required to develop an LEA plan within three months after identification. As part of the process, review and analysis of state test results must be completed. Stakeholders must be consulted throughout the planning process. Parents must be contacted with specific criteria regarding the district status. The district must set aside ten percent of its Title I allocation for professional development activities. An annual review must be conducted and publicized. State improvement grant allocations may be provided to assist the district in examining and developing activities targeted toward the areas which led to the improvement rating. The Office of Federal and State Accountability assists with the planning process and follows up in its monitoring efforts.

Districts identified for corrective under NCLB are in the process of implementing a new curriculum. The Office of Federal and State Accountability has provided grants to fund the purchase, printing and supplemental resources necessary to support the curriculum. All districts have received training provided by the vendor as well as leadership training offered through our regional comprehensive center representatives. Three of the districts participated in initial survey, monitoring and mentoring services offered through the center. To further support the school level implementation, the Office of Federal and State Accountability offered Train the Trainer professional development and provided supplemental grants to allow teachers to observe the curriculum in action for the original three districts. The office has also provided funding for all districts in corrective action to utilize the services of an outside consultant as a curricular facilitator to enhance school level efforts in the implementation process. Each district has identified a district contact person who works with the curricular facilitators along with the Office of Federal and State Accountability assigned education associate in a collaborative fashion to pinpoint challenges, to develop interventions, to provide support and to establish benchmarks for progress.

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments: This information is currently being collected from school districts.	

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

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

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	11/06/07	11/6/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		04/23/07
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	3	0
Schools	15	0
Comments: Appeal calculations are still being conducted but do not appear to impact the overall AYP designation at this time.		

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	12/14/07

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.

All schools identified for improvement were eligible for school improvement funding and received funding in the form of a school improvement grant award. Funds were allocated based on a per-pupil basis of students from low-income families and awarded to the relative LEAs. Activities supported by the school improvement funding are determined by individual school needs in coordination with the LEA to target areas where adequate yearly progress has not been met and therefore resulted in the school being identified for improvement.

For the statewide system of support, the state initiated a contract to provide LEAs in corrective action with a new comprehensive (Pre-K - grade 8) curriculum developed and based on South Carolina state standards in core content subjects. Supported activities included the purchasing, printing, and initial training of teachers in the implementation of the new curriculum. Technical assistance was also provided by the state with this funding through consultants in collaboration with the regional comprehensive center (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory). The consultants evaluated and monitored the LEA's progress through site visits to observe classrooms and to interview stakeholders. Follow-up was conducted periodically via surveys to gauge LEA effort. Additional funding was also awarded equally to these LEAs to provide for supplemental resources and on-going professional development to enhance the implementation process.

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 *from which* students transferred for public school choice	225
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	182
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	110400
Who applied to transfer	3353
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	2695

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 2071328
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	18
Comments:	

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

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

FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

   - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
   - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
   - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.[3]

b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	131
Comments:	

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

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

FAQ about supplemental education services

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

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	52762
Who applied for supplemental educational services	
Who received supplemental educational services	6887
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 5276918
Comments:	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught <u>by</u> teachers who are highly qualified <u>and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified</u> 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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All schools	206994	198068	95.7	8926	4.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	31516	29081	92.3	2435	7.7
Low-poverty schools	45759	44709	97.7	1050	2.3
All elementary schools	152406	146765	96.3	5641	3.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	8788	7715	87.8	1073	12.2
Low-poverty schools	22359	21652	96.8	707	3.2
All secondary schools	54588	51184	93.8	3404	6.2
Comments:					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	__Yes__

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

South Carolina uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 though 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	55.0
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	35.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.0
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	43.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	42.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	15.0
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	90.4	60.2
Poverty metric used	Percent on free or reduced-priced lunch or qualifying for Medicaid.	
Secondary schools	81.1	51.3
Poverty metric used	Percent on free or reduced-priced lunch or qualifying for Medicaid.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.

b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 **T**ITLE **III** AND **L**ANGUAGE **I**NSTRUCTIONAL **P**ROGRAMS

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			
28	Sheltered English instruction			
20	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
37	Content-based ESL			
47	Pull-out ESL			
33	Other (explain)			
Comments: Other - 33 LEAs offer ESOL teacher push in to mainstream classes and 23 LEAs have Newcomer programs.				

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 underlined 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.	25238
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	14250
Russian	424
Vietnamese	330
Arabic	216
Korean	198

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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 underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	24705
Not tested/State annual ELP	1148
Subtotal	25853
LEP/One Data Point	4877
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

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

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	24110
Not tested/State annual ELP	1128
Subtotal	25238
LEP/One Data Point	4758
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	50.0	19345	81.0	Y
No progress		2983		
ELP attainment	0.5	1551	6.5	Y
Comments:				

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments:				

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

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

MFLEP	Yes
Comments:	

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

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

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

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	1565
MFLEP/AYP grades	1067
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

1. **LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do <u>not</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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	9406
LEP HS/Non-AYP	3038
LEP other grades	
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by 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
Comments:		

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.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
529	529	1058
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLELP 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
1058	628	59.4	

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
1058	596	56.3	

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: South Carolina did not disaggregate student exited data in 2006-07 for first year and second year MFLEP. This data will be available starting in SY 2007-08.

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	40
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	28
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	28
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	40
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	28
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	28
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
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
Comments:	

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

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

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

In the table below, indicate whether the State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs.
Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting <u>each</u> State-set target for <u>each</u> objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u> No </u>
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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
8280	1743	2

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	__Yes__	Multi-year	__No Response__
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	__No Response__	Formula	__Yes__

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.	460
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.	310
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	280

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 <u>additional</u> teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do <u>not</u> include the number of teachers <u>currently</u> 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	53	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	48	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	41	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	29	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	35	
Other (Explain in comment box)	16	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	53	14917
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	48	2269
PD provided to principals	49	1085
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	40	903
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	35	158
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	12	
Total		19332
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

<u>**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**</u>

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/06	11/01/06	133
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

South Carolina will require grant applications to be submitted by May 1 instead of July 1 starting with the 2008-09 SY. We will calculate awards as soon as the Title III award arrives and require updated budget reports from LEAs by August 1. Grant awards will be processed as soon as possible after that and money will be loaded for LEAs to use as soon as the grant award is returned to the SCDE by the LEA with the superintendent's signature. This procedure is the required method for awarding grants in the Department and cannot be changed by the Title III Director other than as described above.

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

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	73.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	84.1
Black, non-Hispanic	67.4
Hispanic	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	79.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	40.1
Limited English proficient	59.8
Economically disadvantaged	63.9
Migratory students	40.0
Male	69.2
Female	79.5
Comments:	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4.5
Hispanic	5.4
White, non-Hispanic	3.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3.7
Limited English proficient	3.0
Economically disadvantaged	5.2
Migratory students	
Male	4.7
Female	3.3
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	73	73
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	85	85
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	79	231
K	164	464
1	159	454
2	187	473
3	122	443
4	148	371
5	143	367
6	132	298
7	136	273
8	148	253
9	117	250
10	88	171
11	50	118
12	64	104
Ungraded	0	26
Total	1737	4296
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	369	761
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	799	2957
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	66	270
Hotels/Motels	503	308
Total	1737	4296
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	205
K	334
1	345
2	388
3	387
4	316
5	287
6	206
7	221
8	178
9	154
10	97
11	69
12	71
Ungraded	33
Total	3291
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	153
Migratory children/youth	337
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	393
Limit English proficient students	104
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

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

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	5
2. School Selection	4
3. Transportation	7
4. School records	7
5. Immunizations	6
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	7
Comments: 7. Other Barriers = Funds	

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	268	166
4	211	130
5	178	91
6	158	77
7	142	63
8	101	41
High School	52	34
Comments:		

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	268	146
4	215	123
5	178	95
6	160	79
7	145	75
8	101	32
High School	53	27
Comments:		

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 underlined statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	135
K	76
1	58
2	45
3	40
4	34
5	35
6	28
7	21
8	19
9	20
10	21
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	431
Total	974
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease was not greater 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 underlined unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were underlined served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the underlined summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	106
K	60
1	45
2	36
3	33
4	24
5	28
6	25
7	14
8	12
9	11
10	14
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	121
Total	535
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 06-07 count of 535 is 70 fewer than the 05-06 count of 605. This represents a decrease of 11.5%.

The primary factor in the decrease of the count was a late freeze at Easter. It was publicly reported that 90% of the peach crop was destroyed. Several hundred H2-A workers were immediately sent back home. Since the peach crop is an important source of employment for agricultural workers, many of the families which normally come from other states for the peach harvest didn't come. Even if the peach crop had matured to harvest, there has been an increasing availability and use of single males.

Other factors include:

Crops that use mechanization are being increased, such as corn and soybeans.

There is more tobacco instead of cucumbers and squash in some areas.

High production areas for peaches, apples and tomatoes continue to shift to other land use, such as residential and recreational use (scenic areas of the upstate).

Some families are now settling out for year long employment in other capacities.

Older workers are being employed (over twenty-one), especially in H2-A.

The political climate for the undocumented does not encourage some workers to move about freely. Raids, or rumors of raids, also served to discourage workers with families to migrate with the crops.

Though more OSY were identified, specific program service was more difficult to effect, owing to their long work hours, work week, and shortened time availability on the weekend.

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.

To ensure accuracy and eliminate duplication in the child count process, the MIS2000 electronic data system for both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts is used for migrant program data management. The data were input from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) required by the South Carolina migrant program. The COE is compliant with the COE form issued within the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance of October 23, 2003.

The data review process at the state level was ongoing throughout the reporting year, with thorough review of data presented on each original, completed COE. The manual count with review of COE data served to verify the accuracy of the information put into the MIS2000 system by participating electronic sites and the state site. MIS2000 will continue in use for the next reporting year. Accuracy of data input for each COE will continue to be verified with an additional manual count and review of data for all COEs presented from all sources.

Last year's child counts for both A-1 and A-2 were generated by MIS2000 data system use, with a manual count and review of data for each COE presented from all sources.

The state will continue to use the same systems (electronic and manual) to generate the 2007-2008 Child Count. The MIS2000 data system will continue in use. A manual count with review of data for each COE presented from all sources will be performed at the state level.

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? <u>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.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data that serves to verify the twelve-month and summer counts were collected for the time period of 9/1/06-8/31/07. Migrant recruiters and school districts enrolling migrant students completed a COE documenting the student's name, gender, ethnicity, date and place of birth with verification, and name of parent or guardian. Additionally, the COE requires listing qualifying move and activity, qualifying arrival date and previous residence, along with information from any prior school enrollment. The COE provides line space to describe principal means of livelihood and line space for supporting information for temporary or seasonal work. The COE requires the address of residence within the specified school district, the date of enrollment in school and program in which the student participated. Schools in participating districts for summer programs provided data through completed COEs, MIS2000 data entry and school district enrollment data reports. Additionally, COE data were completed and input for all out-of-school youth (OSY) identified and those identified and served through state recruiters and local summer programs.

The identification and recruitment of migrant families, their children and OSY generated the data collected for this child count. The identification and recruitment process was ongoing throughout this child count period. Two additional state recruiters were employed during the summer crop season to assist the state migrant recruiter. Migrant recruiters visited migrant camps and quarters, local tiendas and migrant health service centers, contacted and visited schools, conferred with district migrant recruiters and used referrals from multiple state and community sources. The other referral and information sources may include all other school district programs such as adult education, and other grant programs such as Migrant Head Start, South Carolina Migrant Health Program, outreach organizations, communities of faith, crew chiefs, other migrant workers and educational referrals from the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT). Data collection, input, and review were ongoing during the period of 9/1/06-8/31/07.

The data were collected from the completed individual COE. Data generated from each completed COE were input into the MIS2000 system by five program sites and the state site. This data then became part of the state data collection within the MIS2000 system. The original hard copy COE was forwarded to the state for the data review and manual count that all COEs are given. The original hard copy COE data were individually reviewed and matched to the uploaded data to ensure accuracy. The state migrant recruiters and school districts not having a migrant summer program or MIS2000 site submitted all original hard copy COEs to the state office for manual count, data review and input into the MIS2000 system. Each COE is coded in the system for type of service that determines child count category assignment and is reviewed for positive identification of eligibility and accuracy of service. Update of eligible migrant information for a COE or in MIS2000 is done on an individual basis. South Carolina does not use mass enrollment or mass withdrawal.

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 data were collected from the completed individual COE. Data generated from each completed COE were input into the MIS2000 system by five program sites and the state site. This data then became part of the state data collection within the MIS2000 system. The original hard copy COE was forwarded to the state for the data review and manual count that all COEs are given. The state migrant recruiters and school districts not having a migrant summer program or MIS2000 site submitted all original hard copy COEs to the state office for manual count, data review and input into the MIS2000 system. Each COE is coded in the system for type of service that determines child count category assignment and is state reviewed for positive identification of eligibility and service. Update of eligible migrant information for a COE or in MIS2000 is done on an individual basis. South Carolina does not use mass enrollment or mass withdrawal.

<u>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.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for the state's Category 2 count were collected and maintained using the same procedures as for the Category 1 count.

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

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

1.10.3.3 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.

All electronic and original, hard copy COE data were required to be provided to the state migrant education office. COE hard copy data not previously input and uploaded by participating program sites were input into the MIS2000 state database by state staff. The COE student data were organized by school district for regular school year enrollment or migrant summer program enrollment, then by grade. From this data input, lists of participants with pertinent, qualifying information were generated. The resultant data count for summer program service was checked against school district summer program enrollment data reports. OSY that were identified as eligible and received service were input with the local school district of residency.

The MIS2000 consolidated database was used for the student information system for child count purposes at the state level. In addition, a manual file system of original, hard copy COEs was maintained, organized by school district.

All COEs and participating districts' enrollment data were reviewed during October and November of 2007. Electronic data entered for all district program sites were examined for accuracy by review of supporting data on the COE's and school district enrollment data. Queries and reports were run on the MIS2000 system at the state level to ensure accuracy of data entered for the five program sites and OSY. Queries were run to filter out any student not meeting the required criteria of 3-21 years of age, within three years of a last qualifying move or resident at least one day for a qualifying activity. To prevent duplication, reports were run that identify students who have matching date of birth and last or first name. Duplicate student information was printed and reviewed, then the data were merged so that students were counted only once within the A-1 and A-2 child counts. To verify accuracy of information provided, participating school districts provided original, hard copies of COEs. These were checked for completion, accuracy, duplication, qualifying activity, qualifying arrival date, residency within three years of a qualifying move, district residency, age eligibility (between 3-21 years of age), and any summer participation. Therefore, through these procedures, confirmation to ensure accuracy in the child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 was performed.

Only those migrant students and OSY fully documented as eligible, during the twelve-month period of September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007, were included in the 2006-2007 Child Count. Since the MIS 2000 system was implemented in the fall of 2000, manual checks and direct review of all information were implemented to verify the accuracy of the data presented. Both original and electronic copies of COEs were thoroughly checked manually, with direct review by state staff of the information provided on each, to assist in screening for accuracy and completeness of required information and to identify any student who did not qualify for eligibility. Any student not meeting all eligibility requirements was disqualified and, therefore, was not entered into the 2006-2007 Child Count. Notice with direct request for clarifying or supporting information was given to the school district of record for any COE in question and to assist in state review determination. State and district migrant recruiters and district personnel were responsible for verifying information provided on a completed COE.

Students enrolled for summer service had eligibility established with a newly completed or updated COE, which was provided to the state. These were checked for accuracy of information establishing eligibility and screened through the enrollment data provided by the school district. These were entered as data specific to summer service within the MIS2000 system; thus, qualifying arrival date was checked to ensure eligibility for service and inclusion in the A-2 count.

Students enrolled in the MIS2000 system were checked for duplication by a combination of direct data review of each COE and assigned student numbers generated by the system. Student names, family names and birth dates were used as screens to eliminate duplication. Additionally, school district enrollment data were used in the screening effort.

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.

MIS2000 and all processes and procedures described within the migrant portion of the CSPR are used for both A-1 and A-2 counts.

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.

Training sessions were held as requested throughout the year to assist district program directors, district recruiters and the state recruiters. Eligibility requirements were provided in written guidance to all involved in the recruiting process. Overall issues related to eligibility of migrant children, principal means of livelihood and temporary or seasonal employment continued to be strongly addressed in state training. New district recruiters received training and support immediately upon notice to the state. Ongoing software support to school district sites was provided this year by MIS2000 support personnel, with technical support and a training workshop provided by the state office for new data entry personnel at participating sites. An annual training is held by the state for all district migrant program personnel prior to the summer program.

To ensure that each child in the child count was eligible for inclusion, the use of a standard COE was required statewide. In addition to available training and direct school district support, the state provided eligibility information and the required COE form on the Migrant Program Web page within the South Carolina Department of Education Web site. This ensured public availability of necessary information and documents. District personnel, district migrant recruiters or the state migrant recruiter conducted a personal interview with OSY or the responsible party for each child identified. Signatures were required for the interviewer, the parent or guardian, and the person certifying the eligibility of the child(ren). All hard copy COEs were reviewed by the state's migrant recruiter for accuracy in determining eligibility. Questioned eligibility was referred to the state level for final determination of eligibility. Site visits and monitoring of district programs provided further opportunity to review COE data or resolve eligibility questions.

The annual re-interview process assisted in verification for accuracy of information received and entered on the COEs. Re-interviewing activity to assess COE information data for newly identified migrant children was performed by the state migrant recruiters. A random sample was determined for the re-interviewing activity.

. The COEs were checked against the enrollment lists provided by the districts. COEs from other sources are reviewed, then input at the state site. Checks for duplication were ongoing. Only eligible students and youths for the 2006-2007 reporting period were entered into the MIS2000 database for this child count period.

A review team in the state office ensured that duplications and students no longer eligible were eliminated from the database. Any COE that was incomplete or showed error was returned to the school district immediately for clarification. If clarification or necessary information could not be provided, that COE was omitted from the child count report data and was maintained separately. Any COE resulting from duplication or ineligibility of the student was archived in a separate manual file for any necessary reference. Summer program participants received immediate review of COE data such that only eligible children were served.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The quality control re-interview process for this year was based on the Rolling Re-interview as developed by the ConQIR Consortium. The recommended procedure was to re-interview at least 100 families within six weeks of COE completion. The re-interview was to be performed before the identified children were enrolled in the summer program, and before any COE data were input into MIS2000. For smaller states with less than 1,000, it was recommended to re-interview at least 10% of those identified. This process was used for small state South Carolina.

Each of the five summer program sites was visited by state migrant recruiters for the re-interview process. COEs were placed in alphabetical order by first child listed on the COE. Then every tenth child was highlighted to be visited. Alternates were selected as follows: From the same alphabetical order, the fifth child was selected as the first sample. The number ten was added such that the fifteenth child, then the twenty-fifth, then the thirty-fifth, etc., were selected in that order to serve as the alternate pool. COEs from districts without a program were compiled as one district, using the same process as stated above.

The goal of the re-interview process was to re-interview the original person identified as having been interviewed on the completed COE. The re-interview was structured not to simply verify information on the COE but to conduct a second interview, then compare the results. If discrepancies were found, effort was made to determine the actual facts at re-interview rather than visiting the family a third time. An additional goal was to conduct the re-interviews face to face with the person who signed the COE within the original interview. If the person wasn't available, contact by phone was attempted before the alternate was used.

The results of the quality control process:

1. Approximately 15% of children identified were selected for the re-interview procedure.

2. 149 re-interviews were conducted.

3. 120 were done face-to-face.

4. 29 were done by phone.

5. 144 were found to be qualifying.

6. 5 were found to be non-qualifying.

7. A 96.6 % confidence level was established.

The Rolling Re-interview results suggest that additional training of recruiters with ongoing review is necessary to progress to a 100% accuracy level.

2006-2007 Rolling Re-interview Data

Number re-interviewed = 149

Face-to-face = 120

By phone = 29

found qualifying = 144

found non qualifying = 5

Confidence level - 96.6%

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.

South Carolina does not merge data. All original COEs were provided to the state office. Each COE was reviewed for completion and accuracy. When the data were input electronically and uploaded to the MIS2000 software, the COE data were compared for completion and accuracy of input at the state level, using the original COE as reference. All COEs supporting the reported data were either newly completed ones or updated ones, and were completed or updated as identification was made during this reporting year.

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.

All data information had comparison review of the original COE data with that of electronic input. MIS2000 reports are run to eliminate duplicates by focusing on elements such as first name, last name, date of birth and varied spelling of names. Any possible duplicates have comparison information reviewed such as parent's name, place of birth, school history or other eligibility data. This is performed for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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.

Based upon the results from the re-interview process, it may be inferred that additional training and ongoing review for the critical elements of eligibility should continue to be the focus for improvement. Districts will again be strongly encouraged to employ the recruiter(s) earlier, so that state training and ongoing review may be accomplished more in advance of the season activity.

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.

Human error is an abiding concern relative to accuracy of information given and received in the identification and recruitment process.

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

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