

**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

MAINE



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

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

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2006-07 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Maine	
Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0023	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Jacqueline Soychak	
Telephone: 207-624-6734	
Fax: 207-624-6731	
e-mail: jacqueline.soychak@maine.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jacqueline Soychak	
_____ Signature	_____ Friday, March 7, 2008, 2:52:24 PM Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maine State Legislature approved new content standards in mathematics, reading and science content in May 2007. The standards become effective beginning with school year 2008-09.
--

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maine has made one change in its mathematics assessment at the high school level. A mathematics augmentation of the SAT was implemented in 2006-07. No changes to the reading assessments occurred or are planned.
--

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Achievement standards were validated for the Maine High School Assessment (SAT and Math Augmentation) in June 2007.

Alternate assessment standards in reading and mathematics were set for four different grade spans (3-4, 5-6, 7-8, and high school) in June 2007.

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 2008 MEA science assessments for grades 4 and 8 continue to be a product of the Maine Department of Education and Measured Progress and are being administered in the spring of 2008.

The 2008 MHSA science test is a continuation of the former Maine Education Assessment (MEA) grade 11 science tests and is a product of the Maine Department of Education and Measured Progress. The test was developed and reviewed from spring of 2007 through January 2008. The Science portion of the Maine High School assessment must be administered during a 2- week window which begins Monday, March 31st and closes Friday, April 11, 2008.

A Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio (PAAP) system has been developed for these tests and is being implemented with identified students in 2007-08 and all tasks must be drawn from an online task bank. The PAAP has been administered in science for the last seven years. Tasks administered in 2006-07 were required to be selected from an online task bank. Because the science portion is administered over two years, teachers were allowed to include teacher developed items administered in 2005-06.

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 2008 achievement standards for grades 4 and 8 were developed and implemented in 2006 for the test results collected in the spring of 2006. these achievement standards will continue to be used for the 2008 test results.

The 2008 MHSA science test achievement standards are consistent with the achievement standards developed for the former Maine Education Assessment (MEA) grade 11 science tests and is a product of the Maine Department of Education. Maine Department of Education suspended science high school testing for the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years. The achievement standards were reviewed and adapted in January of 2008. The achievement standards will be used for standard setting using the results from the administration of the Science portion of the Maine High School assessment during the 2- week window which between Monday, March 31st and Friday, April 11, 2008.

PAAP achievement standards for science have been drafted to serve as the basis for standard setting scheduled for June 2008.

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	102543	101366	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	719	699	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1508	1475	97.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2516	2460	97.8
Hispanic	1091	1055	96.7
White, non-Hispanic	96709	95677	98.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17304	16886	97.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2057	1996	97.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36469	35863	98.3
Migratory students	44	43	97.7
Male	52496	51766	98.6
Female	50047	49600	99.1
Comments: This information is correct			

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	3811	21.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12245	70.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1345	7.7
Total	17401	
Comments: This is correct.		

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	102543	101054	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	719	696	96.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1508	1464	97.1
Black, non-Hispanic	2516	2432	96.7
Hispanic	1091	1052	96.4
White, non-Hispanic	96709	95410	98.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17304	16796	97.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2057	1964	95.5
Economically disadvantaged students	36469	35749	98.0
Migratory students	44	43	97.7
Male	52496	51597	98.3
Female	50047	49457	98.8
Comments: This is correct.			

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	3598	20.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12301	71.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1385	8.0
Total	17284	
Comments: This is correct.		

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	13974	9065	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	93	43	46.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	249	167	67.1
Black, non-Hispanic	369	128	34.7
Hispanic	173	84	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	13090	8643	66.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2443	1000	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	332	107	32.2
Economically disadvantaged students	5439	2798	51.4
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7064	4613	65.3
Female	6910	4451	64.4

Comments: This is the correct information. EDEN will be updated to reflect the correct numbers.

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	13966	9123	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	93	48	51.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	243	171	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	362	149	41.2
Hispanic	173	87	50.3
White, non-Hispanic	13095	8668	66.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2446	875	35.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	339	112	33.0
Economically disadvantaged students	5432	2776	51.1
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7060	4287	60.7
Female	6906	4836	70.0

Comments: Correct EDEN will be updated to reflect the correct numbers.

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	14049	8553	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	67	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	204	136	66.7
Black, non-Hispanic	387	137	35.4
Hispanic	168	78	46.4
White, non-Hispanic	13178	8130	61.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2531	959	37.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	299	106	35.5
Economically disadvantaged students	5456	2601	47.7
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7267	4515	62.1
Female	6782	4032	59.5

Comments: This information is correct! EDEN will be updated to reflect the corrected data.

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	11039	9365	84.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	56	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	202	140	69.3
Black, non-Hispanic	379	170	44.9
Hispanic	168	85	50.6
White, non-Hispanic	13178	8912	67.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2529	921	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	287	89	31.0
Economically disadvantaged students	5450	2927	53.7
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7264	4648	64.0
Female	6775	4722	69.7

Comments: This information is correct! EDEN will be updated to reflect the corrected data.

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	14213	8654	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	102	41	40.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	250	172	68.8
Black, non-Hispanic	376	125	33.2
Hispanic	147	63	42.9
White, non-Hispanic	13338	8196	61.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2499	816	32.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	283	86	30.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5341	2459	46.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7173	4441	61.9
Female	7040	4157	59.0
Comments: This information is correct! EDEN will be updated to reflect corrected data.			

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	14204	8563	60.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	102	38	37.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	248	148	59.7
Black, non-Hispanic	368	142	38.6
Hispanic	147	58	39.5
White, non-Hispanic	13339	8175	61.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2499	661	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	272	69	25.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5331	2403	45.1
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7168	4003	55.8
Female	7036	4560	64.8
Comments: This information is correct! EDEN will be updated to reflect corrected data.			

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	14220	7804	54.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	30	28.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	211	130	61.6
Black, non-Hispanic	349	116	33.2
Hispanic	157	74	47.1
White, non-Hispanic	13398	7453	55.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2320	490	21.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	298	95	31.9
Economically disadvantaged students	5248	2039	38.9
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7249	3966	54.7
Female	6970	3837	55.1
Comments: This information is correct!			

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	14200	9230	65.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	103	48	46.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	208	132	63.5
Black, non-Hispanic	338	164	48.5
Hispanic	158	89	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	13392	8797	65.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2312	606	26.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	282	104	36.9
Economically disadvantaged students	5235	2610	49.9
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7236	4324	59.8
Female	6963	4906	70.5
Comments: This information is correct!			

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	14774	7763	52.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	111	35	31.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	177	121	68.4
Black, non-Hispanic	340	104	30.6
Hispanic	128	50	39.1
White, non-Hispanic	14017	7453	53.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2244	376	16.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	273	86	31.5
Economically disadvantaged students	5253	1936	36.9
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7585	3979	52.5
Female	7188	3784	52.6
Comments: This information is correct!			

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	14767	10195	69.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	54	48.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	175	124	70.9
Black, non-Hispanic	333	158	47.4
Hispanic	125	75	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	14021	9783	69.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2248	616	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	260	90	34.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5250	2886	55.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7589	4750	62.6
Female	7177	5444	75.9
Comments: This information is correct!			

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	15242	7809	51.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	99	29	29.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	187	114	61.0
Black, non-Hispanic	316	93	29.4
Hispanic	149	60	40.3
White, non-Hispanic	14489	7512	51.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2284	375	16.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	274	75	27.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5275	1816	34.4
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7756	4031	52.0
Female	7484	3777	50.5
Comments: This information is correct!			

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	15242	9874	64.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	100	43	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	187	119	63.6
Black, non-Hispanic	312	149	47.8
Hispanic	148	81	54.7
White, non-Hispanic	14493	9480	65.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2285	451	19.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	267	90	33.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5277	2537	48.1
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7752	4490	57.9
Female	7488	5382	71.9
Comments: This information is correct!			

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	14137	5506	38.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	72	13	18.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	191	89	46.6
Black, non-Hispanic	295	41	13.9
Hispanic	124	39	31.5
White, non-Hispanic	13455	5324	39.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1820	124	6.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	250	40	16.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3390	721	21.3
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7190	2886	40.1
Female	6947	2620	37.7

Comments: With only one migrant student who is not proficient, the answer is 0

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	13819	6266	45.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	22	31.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	182	71	39.0
Black, non-Hispanic	281	63	22.4
Hispanic	118	38	32.2
White, non-Hispanic	13169	6072	46.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1725	189	11.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	235	26	11.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3271	924	28.2
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	7017	3021	43.1
Female	6802	3245	47.7

Comments: Only one migrant student to take the test and was not proficient, hence 0.

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	631	444	70.4
Districts	220	210	95.4

Comments: The number of districts has been adjusted to reflect and unduplicated number. In previous years, some districts may have been listed in more than one category.

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	431	331	76.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	19	12	63.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	412	319	77.4

Comments: This data is correct.

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

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
214	201	93.9

Comments: This data is correct

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.

Maine's current statewide system of support promotes a continuous learning model of technical assistance and includes collaboration with various educational entities, such as the New England Comprehensive Center, and the Maine Education Leadership Consortium. This statewide support also includes regularly scheduled technical assistance workshops, webinar sessions, and personalized technical assistance visits.

Some specific examples of statewide support are regional NCLB workshops, held throughout the year, to provide NCLB updates and technical assistance to LEA staff. In the fall, school improvement team members, along with MDOE assessment staff, present regional workshops which provide an in-depth look at assessment and accountability reporting. Opportunities and strategies for data-driven decision making and analysis are also shared. In the spring, NCLB team representatives provide technical assistance and updates related to No child Left Behind regulations, the application and funding process and accountability.

This fall, with assistance from the New England Comprehensive Center, the school improvement team launched a new avenue for providing statewide support. A series webinar sessions, based on survey responses the field, was developed. The webinars will focus on content area literacy, co-teaching, differentiation and formative assessment. All sessions will be archived and available on the web, providing support for an audience that extends beyond Title IA priority schools.

Maine's model for school improvement currently includes a variety of the strategies. Our work with each new priority school begins with a customized technical assistance approach. MDOE school improvement consultants work very closely with each identified LEA and their school improvement teams to complete a needs assessment and create a comprehensive plan for improvement that includes short and long term strategies. These plans frequently include customized professional development activities designed to change instructional practice and whenever possible, create partnerships. Maine's school improvement team will begin working with five new CIP schools in 2007-2008.

This individualized model continues through subsequent years of priority status, and includes regular monitoring of plan implementation. In addition to assistance with school improvement planning, MDOE school improvement consultants also provide technical assistance with various communications, such as parent notification letters, ensuring that all required elements have been included and shared on a timely basis. Eighteen CIP schools will continue to receive technical assistance and funding support in 2007-2008.

Maine's model for Title IA school improvement planning process includes a strong emphasis on coaching and support. One of the common challenges experienced by many of our priority schools is a lack of coherence with the planning process. Consultants may provide assistance relative to effective scheduling or by reviewing school improvement plans to insure that the decisions are data driven, that instructional needs of all students are being addressed and that all instructional staff members, such as Special Education staff, are participating in training opportunities.

Utilizing this directed, personalized model, Maine has seen a high percentage of Title IA priority schools exit priority status and continue to achieve adequate yearly progress. Since fall of 2003, the school improvement team has worked directly with 31 schools. Of these schools, 13 (42%) have exited priority status and all but one Made AYP in 2007. The remaining 18 schools are currently in priority status and receiving directed support. Of these schools, 9 (50%) made AYP in 2007 and could exit priority status in 2008. Three of the schools added last year had not previously been served by Title IA. District administrators of these three schools reported that although these schools were already in priority status and would have sanctions including SES, they wanted to access the technical assistance and funds for available for Title IA school improvement.

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	6
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	3
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
Comments: Maine law does not allow several of the options listed above. There are currently no schools in year 2 (CIPS5) of restructuring.	

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

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

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maine currently has no districts identified for improvement or corrective action.

Information related to improvement strategies is made available through fall and spring regional workshops.

Information related to districts that have not made AYP for 1 year (Monitor status) is made available to members of the statewide support team. These groups include NCLB Title directors (including Title IIA), content area specialists, regional representatives, and professional development coordinators. This strategy provides an avenue for making connections and developing systems of support.

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: Maine currently has not districts in corrective action.	

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	11/15/07	11/15/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	8/15/07	8/15/07
Comments: Preliminary identification for Title IA schools with grades 3-8 in improvement status was provided prior to the start of school. This allowed schools to provide required parental notification.		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	157	24
Comments: The numbers for schools noted above represent appeals that came forward during the review of assessment data. In Maine, the adjustments are made prior to the public release of annual AYP. Only 1 of the appeals came after the release of the list and resulted in a slight change. (The school remained in priority status, but the year was corrected.)		

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	11/12/07
---	----------

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.

Funds provided through 1003 (a) are currently provided to all eligible Title IA schools that are currently in CIPS status or in the first year of exiting CIPS status. To date, funds have been ample enough to provide support for school improvement activities and prioritization of funds has not been necessary. Should the number of schools increase beyond the availability of funds, a prioritization process, which considers level of need and commitment, is available and will be utilized. 1003 (a) funds will be allocated to schools meeting the following criteria:

• Must be Title I

• Must be in CIPS1 status or higher (CIPS is Maine's term for priority status)

• Must be in year two of Making AYP, exiting priority status and in year two of CIPS improvement planning.

If necessary, funds will be allocated to the schools that meet the criteria listed above and also demonstrate the greatest need. Greatest need is defined as

• Not making AYP in both Reading and Math; or

• Not making AYP in either Reading or Math in the whole group; or

• Not making AYP in either Reading or Math in multiple subgroups.

A school's level of commitment may also be considered. This commitment will be determined, first, by reviewing the completion of required elements, including:

• Parent notification letters

• Title IA application project sheets for required set asides

• Title IA performance report data

• CIPS 2-year improvement plan- completed and approval by team

In addition, school improvement plans will be reviewed for completion. Schools completing at least 85% of planned activities will be given priority for receiving additional funds. Title IA school improvement plans are monitored regularly and do not receive reimbursement until activities are complete and required documentation is submitted.

Title IA 1003 (a) funds are used to support a variety of activities that support school improvement planning. School improvement plans frequently include customized professional development activities designed to change instructional practice and whenever possible, create partnerships. Other activities may be directed towards completion of needs assessments or the development of data teams to encourage data driven decision making. Parental involvement activities are also required in the planning process.

An important aspect of Title IA school improvement planning is to insure integration of new funds with other NCLB funding. During the initial stages of the planning process, a review is completed to determine what LEA and school initiatives are currently being implemented and how other funding sources are included. Every attempt is made to coordinate new efforts with those activities currently scheduled and to coordinate funding sources whenever possible to encourage a higher level of district participation. State school improvement team members communicate regularly with other NCLB team members to share information related to schools being served, initiatives in the process of implementation, and needs which might be better served at the LEA or SEA level.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

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

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	0
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	0
Comments: In 2006-07, parents did not elect to exercise this option.	

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	7727
Who applied to transfer	0
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	0

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes <u> </u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No Response <u> </u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response <u> </u>
Comments: There were no students who utilized the school choice option in 2006-07.	
The eligible number of students listed above (7727) includes 6407 for whom choice is not available because there is only one school available in the district for grade levels eligible for choice.	

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0
Comments: There were no students who utilized the school choice option in 2006-07.	

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	17
Comments: The 17 schools included in the count above have only one school available for grade levels eligible for school choice.	

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

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	5
Comments:	

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

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

FAQ about supplemental education services

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

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	1207
Who applied for supplemental educational services	78
Who received supplemental educational services	76
Comments: In one school, 2 students applied for SES, but no provider was available.	

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	\$ 75157
Comments:	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	53256	50549	94.9	2707	5.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	6316	6022	95.3	294	4.7
Low-poverty schools	3290	3196	97.1	94	2.9
All elementary schools	18710	17953	96.0	757	4.0
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	4757	4437	93.3	320	6.7
Low-poverty schools	12555	11941	95.1	614	4.9
All secondary schools	34546	32596	94.4	1950	5.6
Comments:					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

the State of Maine counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	38.3
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	15.7
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	42.8
Other (please explain)	3.2
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	18.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.0
Other (please explain)	5.4
Total	100.0
Comments: This is correct	

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	49.9	25.0
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for the free and reduced lunch program.	
Secondary schools	49.9	25.0
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for the free and reduced lunch program.	
Comments: These Poverty Figures are the same as we have successfully submitted in previous years.		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
1	Dual language	French	50.0	50.0
2	Two-way immersion	French	80.0	20.0
1	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	90.0	10.0
0	Developmental bilingual	NA	0.0	0.0
2	Heritage language	Passamaquoddy	50.0	50.0
9	Sheltered English instruction			
7	Structured English immersion			
4	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
7	Content-based ESL			
1	Pull-out ESL			
0	Other (explain)			

Comments: Programs vary from 3 times a week for 45 minutes in the OLOI to 50/50.

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

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	2934
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
Somali	1061
Spanish	429
French	301
Khmer	235
Chinese	223

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Arabic - 178, Passamaquoddy - 174

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	3760
Not tested/State annual ELP	127
Subtotal	3887
LEP/One Data Point	1173
Comments: This is correct	

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

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

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	2851
Not tested/State annual ELP	83
Subtotal	2934
LEP/One Data Point	813
Comments: This is correct.	

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

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

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	10.9	597	26.1	Y
No progress		1690		
ELP attainment	55.0	1381	60.4	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	0.0	0	0.0	Y
No progress		0		
ELP attainment	0.0	0	0.0	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 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

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

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

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

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

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	#
Total MFLEP	232
MFLEP/AYP grades	166
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	712
LEP HS/Non-AYP	755
LEP other grades	15
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	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 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	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5.4 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
0	0	0.0
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
0	0	0.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
54	69	123
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
123	104	84.6	19

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
123	116		<N

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

Comments: Counts at different dates because testing windows are not the same dates and enrollment at the time of AYP testing can differ

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	12
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	10
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	10
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	10
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	11
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	11
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	11
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	11
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	2
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	1
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
555	164	1

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	89
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.	130
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	58

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	10	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	5	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	10	1049
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	124
PD provided to principals	10	56
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	10	50
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	8	338
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	6	61
Total		1678
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/20	08/01/20	30
Comments: If subgrantees have met application and performance report filing requirements, funds are distributed.		

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.

NA

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: 2006-07 School Year.	
Sources of Data: Maine School Incidences of Prohibited Behavior Data(Reported Expulsions)collected during 2004-05 2005-06 and 2006-07.	
Maine Gun-Free Schools Reports collected during 2004-05 2005-06 and 2006-07.	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	65.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.7
Black, non-Hispanic	76.6
Hispanic	75.9
White, non-Hispanic	83.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	81.1
Female	85.3
Comments: Maine was not able to determine the data for this year because the count of dropouts by subgroups was not available for all the years required in the computation.	

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	5.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5.4
Hispanic	8.2
White, non-Hispanic	5.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7.7
Limited English proficient	7.8
Economically disadvantaged	8.9
Migratory students	12.7
Male	6.1
Female	4.6
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	290	257
LEAs with subgrants	3	3
Total	293	260
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	56	0
1	57	0
2	47	0
3	50	0
4	40	0
5	38	0
6	45	0
7	36	<N
8	55	11
9	66	39
10	90	63
11	81	43
12	111	44
Ungraded	0	81
Total	772	
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	209	110
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	394	143
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	26	30
Hotels/Motels	73	0
Total	702	283
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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	<N
8	11
9	39
10	63
11	43
12	44
Ungraded	81
Total	

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	225
Migratory children/youth	<N
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	72
Limit English proficient students	<N

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

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

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	0
2. School Selection	0
3. Transportation	2
4. School records	0
5. Immunizations	0
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	1
Comments: student physical and mental health issues	

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	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	<N	<N
High School	<N	0
Comments: subgrants are for older middle school and high school basically unaccompanied youth not elementary age		

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	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	<N	0
High School	<N	0
Comments: subgrants do not service elementary age youth		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23
K	26
1	30
2	30
3	25
4	35
5	28
6	35
7	24
8	19
9	13
10	14
11	13
12	<N
Ungraded	29
Out-of-school	<N
Total	348

Comments: After submitting the initial Category 1 Child Count in December, the MEP Director conducted a record-by-record review of all the original data on reports generated from the MIS2000 migrant education database to verify eligibility and confirmed presence in Maine during the reporting period. Any questions about counting details were directed to the OME staff. The resulting modifications show a slight decrease in overall numbers, as well as a slight redistribution of grades. Additionally, the MEP has noted that migrant students represented in EDEN data are based on migrant status as determined by the LEA's. Due to confusion at the local level regarding eligibility requirements, the LEA determinations of migrant student status do not coincide with the MEP-maintained data on migrant student status. The MEP is in the process of developing procedures, in conjunction with the state EDEN data manager, to eliminate such discrepancies for the 2007-2008 reporting period. Additionally, details of the discrepancies for the 2006-2007 reporting period will be maintained at the State level, with assistance from Title I Accountability.

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.

Decreases in number for Category 1 child count from 2005-06 to 2006-07 may be due to any of the following reasons:

- Minimal staffing during the reporting period and resultant impact on state-wide recruiting efforts;
- Difficulty on part of MEP staff to determine "presence in Maine" for eligible children neither served nor enrolled in Maine schools during the reporting period. Follow-up with recruited children from previous years was not consistent. MIS2000 data indicated five times as many "eligible" students as we were able to verify as "eligible and present within the state during the reporting period";
- Possible decrease in human laborers in some agricultural areas;
- Possible decrease in migrating families and trend towards older adults travelling independently to complete work.

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

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12
K	17
1	24
2	17
3	16
4	23
5	18
6	18
7	13
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	169
Comments: Following the record-by-record review, the Category 2 Child Count is actually 176. Review of summer attendance sheets revealed a slightly higher number of students served.	

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 summer session total is nearly the same as last year, differing by nine children (decrease). A certain decrease is to be expected as there is anecdotal evidence from both workers and employers that there are fewer workers returning to the state each season.

*Following a record-by-record review in January, the Category 2 count indicates a smaller decrease than originally perceived (-2).

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.

What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period: MIS 2000

Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? Yes

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

Child data was collected by recruiters and MEP staff.

Student information included:

Parent/Guardian first and last name; Current address (including city, state, zip); Current phone and work phone; permanent (homebase) address (including city, state, zip) and homebase phone; student ID#; student first/middle/last name; grade; birth date; sex; age; place of birth;

Eligibility information:

LQM date; residency date; origin and destination of move; name of qualifying worker; relation to child; seek/obtain work; temporary/seasonal work; type of work; specific activity; reason for temporary work; importance to livelihood; Employer; additional comments; signature of parent/guardian and recruiter.

School information:

Homebase school; current school; date of enrollment; type of services; # hours of service; total days enrolled; total days present; graduating; secondary credits; performance data; special services; withdrawal date; expected destination; reason for withdrawal; teacher signature; school unit; date of form submission.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

The LEA completed Migrant student data forms and COE's for the students participating in the extended-day program and the Broccoli Harvest School. One part-time recruiter for the Broccoli Harvest School completed the data collection by way of personal interviews with families. The recruiter was a returning staff person for the Broccoli Harvest school and did not receive additional training during the reporting period. The program was visited by MEP staff and an on-site interview conducted with the recruiter to verify that proper protocol was followed during the recruitment process.

One full-time, seasonal state recruiter, one full-time blueberry harvest recruiter, and three part-time recruiters were hired for the Blueberry Harvest School. Recruitment for the blueberry harvest was overseen by the MEP Education Specialist. Recruiters for the Blueberry Harvest received 6 hours of training, plus on-going, on-site training for the duration of the 3.5 week program. All recruiters carried out personal interviews with the parents or guardians of eligible children and completed COE's, which were signed by both parent/guardian and recruiter. COE's were reviewed by state MEP staff and entered into MIS2000.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

Data were collected at the time of enrollment for each of the programs. Withdrawal data were collected at the time of move or withdrawal from the program, or in the case of the Broccoli and Blueberry Harvest Schools, after the program ended.

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.

N/A

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 child count data is input at the time the student is enrolled, updated or withdrawn. Data is input by the MEP staff regardless of whether the information is collected by MEP staff, seasonal employees, or LEA staff. Updates are entered by MEP staff when student data sheets are submitted to the SEA from the LEA, or in the case of the MEP run program, at the close of the program term.

The data was organized within the MIS2000 report in the following manner:

The report was generated to capture the population as specified in 1.10.3.3.

The report included the following fields:

Student seq; birth date; last name; first name; middle name; student ID; student seq; LQM date; res date; enroll date; withdraw date; funding date; district name

COE date; Dbid; Domid; Sh Seq; student seq 2; grade; birthdate; homebase city; homebase state code; homebase country; homebase school;

Address; city; state code; zip,Phone; Term date; sex; race; type; facility name; facility Id; city; Student last first; age; activity in reporting period.

The total number of eligible children identified in this report were initially divided by "active" and "inactive". The "active" group included those students who had an enroll date, withdraw date, funding date, LQM date, res date or term date during the reporting period. The "inactive" group included all students who were eligible based on date of last qualifying move, but had not shown any activity in any of the fields listed above during the reporting period.

Data is updated by the MEP staff in Augusta based on information gathered either via follow-up phone calls to parents by MEP staff or trained temporary workers, or via personal interviews by the state or seasonal recruiters.

The current state of data maintenance requires a thorough review. One of the issues of greatest concern is the discrepancy between the MEP database (MIS2000) and the State of Maine education database (MEDMS) and the classification of migrant eligible students.

For the MEP database, MEP staff reviewed each record for the reporting period and cross-referenced with both summer attendance sheets and MEDMS to determine Category 1 and 2 counts for 2006-07. Migrant eligibility determinations are established by MEP staff and input to MIS2000 after review of the COE. Currently, there is still a mechanism in place through which LEA's indicate migrant eligibility in the state database, MEDMS. MEDMS data is used to populate EDEN reports. The population determined "migrant eligible" by the LEA's in MEDMS is not consistent with the MEP's identified population in MIS2000. Currently, steps are being developed to implement procedures that allow MEP staff to make corrections to the eligibility "flag" in MEDMS. MEP staff and the EDEN data manager will cross reference lists of students deemed eligible in both databases and reconcile discrepancies on March 28, prior to the scheduled capture of 2007-2008 student data. An MEP staff member will continue to work during 2008 to cross-reference MIS2000 data with MEDMS and notify schools of eligible children in their districts and manually correct the eligible student status in the state database. Prior to any additional scheduled captures of data, MEP and the EDEN data manager will review for discrepancies.

In addition to reconciling these two conflicting databases, MEP is developing a more systematic approach to updating MIS2000 data including:

Revising and clarifying data collection tools and procedures for participating LEA's;

Review of data elements (definitions & management) in MIS2000;

Developing a schedule of regular data maintenance;

Building on the communications with LEA's to increase the accuracy and time relevance of student data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data was collected and maintained in the same manner as Category 1 data. The steps taken to complete the actual count are described in the next section.

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

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The eligible and active students portion of the report displays a count and list of students meeting the following criteria:

LQM3Date is after the start date; BirthDate is before the end date and Twenty SecondBDay is after the startdate; DomID is ME; enrolldate, withdrawDate, fundingdate; LQMdate, resdate; or termdate is between startdate and enddate.

The eligible and inactive students portions of this report displays a count and list of student meeting the following criteria:

LQM3Date is after the startDate, BirthDate is before the EndDate and TwentySecondBDay is after the StartDate, DomID is ME

The age field is dynamic, so ages were calculated as of August 31, 2007. Data were sorted by age and students under the age of 3 or over the age of 21 were not included in either Category 1 or 2 counts.

Students on the Active list indicated a qualifying move date, enrollment date, withdraw date, funding date, residence date, or term date during the reporting period. There were 267 students identified on the MIS2000 report as "active" during the reporting period.

Children who received a MEP-funded summer service all appeared on the Active report. This report was compared to a name list provided by the LEA of students served during the reporting period's Broccoli Harvest School. Weekly attendance sheets from the summer Blueberry Harvest School 2007 were compared to the Active list from MIS2000 and only those students who attended the school for at least one day were included in the Category 2 count. Initially, the students from the fall 2006 extended-day program in Caribou were included in the Category 2 count. Upon clarification with OME, the MEP went back in to determine which children were mistakenly included and which grade they had been assigned. The total number of children who had been mistakenly included was three, one each in grade 8,10,and 11. These were deducted from the Category 2 count.

The remaining students on the active list were reviewed to verify that either the LQM date, residence date, enrollment date, or withdraw date indicated a presence in the state of Maine during the reporting period. Those students for whom the data did not verify a presence in Maine during the reporting period were excluded from the Category 1 count (11 children).

Grade level for active students, present in Maine for at least one day during the reporting period, was determined based on MIS2000 data, and where necessary, verified by reference to COE's.

Children on the inactive list indicated a qualifying move or qualifying activity during the three years prior to the reporting period. Children on the Inactive list could not be verified as resident in Maine during the reporting period by the data that was available in MIS2000. Therefore, MEP staff ran a comparison report with the State of Maine DOE database, MEDMS, which includes all students enrolled in Maine schools. The comparison report used the time frame indicated by the reporting period. Any students who were cross-listed in MEDMS were considered to be resident for at least one day during the reporting period, due to their enrollment in Maine schools. MIS2000 indicated 490 eligible, inactive students during the reporting period. Maine DOE's MEDMS system verified the presence of 104 children in Maine school systems during this same period. Only the 104 children cross-listed in MEDMS are included in the Category 1 count and grades are determined based on the MEDMS data.

The original report generated by the MIS2000 included one duplicate record which was corrected during the January review. The students counted in Category 2 attended either the Broccoli Harvest School or the Blueberry Harvest School, programs that ran concurrently, so students were not able to attend both.

All students on the original download were selected due to a Last Qualifying Move date between Sept 1, 2003 and August 31, 2007. From that population, the initial subgroups were called "active" and "inactive".

The Active list was defined by: Having an enrollment date, withdraw date, funding date, LQM date, residency date, or termination date between September 1, 2006 and August 31, 2007.

The Inactive list was defined by: Having a qualifying move date during the three years prior to the reporting period (Sept. 1, 2003-August 31, 2006).

As indicated in the CSPR Part I, absent any verifiable activity with the MEP during the reporting period, the only way to determine if any inactive eligible students were residing in the State of Maine during the period of Sept. 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007, was to run a comparison report in MEDMS to locate matches in the State database. The EDEN coordinator ran a comparison from a list that included the following fields: Student ID, Last name, first name, middle name, birth date, age, sex, race, and facility name.

Following the initial submission of the December CSPR Part I, a record-by-record review was conducted to ensure that each child included on the active list could be accounted for within the State of Maine during the reporting period. This was accomplished by reviewing summer attendance sheets for both the Blueberry Harvest School and the Broccoli Harvest School, as well as matching any other students in the state database, MEDMS. Any difference in the resulting child counts is reflected in the revised Part I.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 and 2 essential data was collected from MIS2000 using the criteria outlined in part I of 1.10.3.3. Verification of presence in Maine for the population of inactive students was obtained via MEDMS (Maine DOE database) based on the original inactive list generated by MIS2000. For the Category 2 count, data was verified by comparing student names to actual attendance sheets or student lists maintained by the LEA (in the case of the Broccoli Harvest School).

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.

- During the 2007 Blueberry Harvest School, recruiters received 6 hours of on-site training prior to the actual recruiting period. There were two full-time recruiters and two part-time recruiters. One full-time recruiter, both part-time recruiters, and the recruitment supervisor, were employees with prior experience in the ID&R element of the Migrant Education Program. The full-time recruiters received additional training and supervision in the field during the first week of the Blueberry Harvest School. The Blueberry Harvest School (BHS) recruiters completed COE's for eligible students.

- During the fall 2006 period, Parent-Student surveys from the school systems were reviewed by MEP staff and temporary Migrant Education Program assistants, who had received a 2-day (4 hour) training by the MEP Director and Migrant Education Specialist which consisted of:

- o Training on "what is a migrant worker"
- o Training on "who is a migrant student"
- o Training on "what is the Migrant Education Program"
- o Training on conducting a phone interview
- o Training on completing a call log
- o Training on completing a "sample" COE

- One-on-one sessions with MEP staff and Temps throughout entire calling process. (Approximately 3-4 weeks)

- o Answered questions that would arise from phone calls made to families
- o Provided additional training on conducting a phone interview (including how to ask the proper questions)

The MEP staff and temporary assistants conducted follow-up phone calls as Parent-Student surveys were received from the school districts. 438 surveys were found to be ineligible based on phone call results. No data is available on total number of calls conducted and the total results of qualifying surveys.

The SEA uses a standard, triplicate COE to collect consistent data on eligible children. The COE is signed by both recruiter and parent. One copy is available for parent, for the SEA, and for the LEA.

Recruiters conduct personal interviews with families of eligible children. All interviews during the blueberry and broccoli harvests are conducted as face-to-face interviews. COE's were reviewed by SEA office staff and follow-up phone interviews were conducted to verify data.

Since July of 2007, all COE's are reviewed by the education specialist and then forwarded to the director in cases of ambiguous or incomplete data, or cases where the student does not appear to be eligible. The director then determines ineligibility (in cases of complete information) or whether a follow-up interview is necessary to gather more information for determining eligibility or ineligibility. Follow-up interviews were carried out by the state recruiter, the education specialist, a trained temporary staff, or the director.

SEA staff visited the site of the Broccoli Harvest School in 2007 to review recruiting procedures with the staff in the Caribou school district.

Questions of eligibility are discussed at the state level and doubts or ambiguous situations are referred to the OME Program Officer.

The state recruiter attended the 2007 ID&R conference in Kansas City, MO, in order to update skills and knowledge.

The weakness currently in the area of quality control for the Maine MEP is data maintenance. With several years of staff turn-over, much of the routine maintenance schedule has been lost. The specific purpose of certain data fields needs to be reviewed and a

system established for regular maintenance. As outlined in section 1.10.3.2, such a system would involve an initial clarification of discrepancies between the state database and the MEP database in terms of "migrant eligible" classifications, as well as multiple steps to increase timely and accurate data exchange with LEA's, and regular scheduled maintenance of MEP data in MIS2000.

In terms of COE's, the Maine MEP needs to review and compare the data elements on the current COE and the data required for the MSIX information exchange. Any adjustments should be made prior to the 2008 harvest season.

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.

Follow-up phone interviews utilized an "interview protocol" form that included the following items:

Student ID#, Student name, telephone number, school district, interviewer's name, translator's name, date, time of call, name of parent/guardian with whom conversation took place, notation of "refusal to speak", and notation for "unable to make contact", notation of qualifying move.

The interview included the following questions:

1. Has your family (or part of your family) moved to seek work in the last few years? If so, when was the move made? [Note: if the family did not move to seek work, probe further by referring to the information on the COE "Did you move to (town)?", "Where did you move from?", "Why did you make this move?" (there may be multiple reasons for the move), "When did you make this move?"]
2. Who made the move?
3. Where did you move from? Where did you move to? [Ask the names of the towns.]
4. What kind of work were you looking for and/or find? [Note: Ask about the nature of the work when it is not clear on the job duties (i.e. trucking logs; if wreathing, did they also tip?) You may need to ask additional questions to determine if the work was temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or fishing. (i.e. When was the work (job) expected to start and end?)]
5. Did the work play an important part in providing a living for your family? [Note: Ask questions to distinguish between earnings used for basic necessities (heat, rent, lights, car repairs, taxes, etc.)to paying for a family vacation. "Why did you need to do this work?", "What was the money earned used for?"]
6. Did your child(ren) move with you? What are the names and ages of the children who moved with you (at that time)? [Note: if the child(ren) did not move at that time, did they join the parent(s)/guardian(s) at a later time? If so, ask the date they joined the parent (s)/guardian(s). If children are older, ask if any had already graduated or obtained their GED at the time of the move.]
7. When you made the move, did your child(ren) need to change schools? Do you remember the name of the new school?

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.

During the year, the MEP Education Specialist reviewed individual COE's and input data into MIS2000. Individual student records were reviewed by the MEP Director. Any found ambiguities were clarified with the families by phone by MEP staff.

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.

MEP staff discussed the report parameters at length with the MIS2000 data administrator to ensure that the appropriate report was generated to include a complete "base list" of all children eligible during the reporting period. The base list included active and inactive students, which were ultimately counted using the method described in 1.10.3.3. MEP staff searched in program files for evidence of follow-up interviews and logs indicating numbers of calls made and results.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The greatest single action for the SEA is to stabilize the MEP staffing arrangement so that loss of information and skills is not a recurring theme. The MEP staff at the state level can take several steps towards improving recruitment and data management in the upcoming months:

Conduct random re-interviews (hiring outside assistance if necessary) at least twice a year;

Conduct re-interviews (hiring outside assistance) for all the the 2007 BHS COE's;

Clean-up MEDMS and unify databases used by MEP and DOE;

Enhance recruiter training for all recruiters;

Expand recruitment efforts beyond school surveys and current broccoli and blueberry harvest;

Enhance data entry forms from schools;

Conduct more comprehensive initial eligibility interviews;

Hire second seasonal recruiter for state of Maine MEP;

Conduct informational sessions for school districts, either via Web sessions, direct workshops, or utilization of the regional representatives, as an effort to clarify the role, purpose, and services of the MEP.

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.

There has been an on-going rotation of staffing at the Maine MEP and consequently, an on-going rotational loss of expertise. Each year, many of the same questions revolving around eligibility issues resurface, both at the SEA and at the LEA's. There is widespread confusion within the school districts as to who qualifies as a migrant-eligible student and what services are available through the MEP. Likewise, there is moderate disarray in the filing system at the SEA, due to staff rotation and varying systems of organization. For example, we have been unable to locate documentation of total phone calls made and total qualifying families located during the fall 2006 follow-up interviews to the school Parent-Student surveys.

The May 2004 Interim Corrective Action Plan for the State of Maine MEP, conducted from October 2003 - October 2005 outlines specific steps to be taken to improve quality control of the recruitment process. The current recruitment process reflects many of those changes, however, additional steps towards refining the process can be taken with the advantage of a long-term staffing arrangement. (See previous item). During review of the September 1, 2006 - August 31, 2007 reporting period, one program was identified as serving ineligible children during the extended-day program. The error appeared to be a reflection of the confusion at the LEA level and did not seem to represent a deliberate attempt at falsification of data. The four children identified were all members of a single family whose eligibility had been misinterpreted by the LEA. The identification of the error was possible due to the

consolidated efforts of the SEA staff. With a more permanent staffing at the SEA, greater progress can be made to establish a clear administrative process as the State level, fortify the relationships with schools, increase the presence and improve the image of the MEP within the agricultural, forestry and fishing industries, and build a new program construction that relies on clear and accurate recruitment protocol.

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

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