

**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

NEW JERSEY



**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: New Jersey	
Address: 100 River View Plaza Trenton, New Jersey 08625	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Clare Barrett	
Telephone: (609) 292-5408	
Fax: (609) 633-6874	
e-mail: clare.barrett@doe.state.nj.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lucille E. Davy	
_____ Signature	_____ Tuesday, March 4, 2008, 4:04:41 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.

Revised math and language arts literacy standards are expected to be adopted by the State Board at their January 2008 meeting. The full revision process including all nine New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards is on a five-year revision cycle. We will begin the revision process in January 2008.

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.

For New Jersey 2006-2007 represented the second year in which the state administered statewide assessments in language arts and mathematics at grades 3-8 and high school in accordance with ESEA/NCLB requirements. In addition New Jersey implemented an Alternate Proficiency Assessment (APA) embracing grades 3 through 8 and high school in 2006-2007 in language arts mathematics and science to assess the progress of students with severe cognitive disabilities.

It should be noted that New Jersey assesses both reading and writing as language arts literacy (LAL).

Starting in 2007-2008 New Jersey will be implementing newly redesigned assessments in mathematics and language arts literacy (LAL). This implementation will begin with grades 5-8 in 2008 and then broaden to include grades 3-4 in 2009. New performance standards for grades 5-8 will be established in 2008 and new standards for grades 3-4 in 2009.

Also the grade 5-8 assessments in 2008 will be provided for the first time in Spanish-Language versions for Spanish-speaking English Language Learners.

In May 2008, the state will pilot test an end of course Algebra II test developed in conjunction with the American Diploma Project consortium.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2007-2008 school year, the New Jersey Benchmarks for Adequate Yearly Progress will be increased. In LAL: for grades 3-5 the benchmark will increase from 75% to 82% proficient; grades 6-8 the benchmark increases from 66% to 76% proficient; for grade 11 the benchmark increases from 79% to 85%. In Mathematics: for grades 3-5 the benchmark will increase from 62% to 73% proficient; grades 6-8 the benchmark increases from 49% to 62% proficient; for grade 11 the benchmark increases from 64% to 74%.

RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION:

Revised content standards in mathematics and language arts literacy were adopted in January 2008 by the State Board of Education and reflect the recommendations made by Achieve, Inc. In addition, the New Jersey Department of Education is required by state administrative code to review and update the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in all content areas, including mathematics and language arts literacy, in a five-year cycle. The primary goal of the 2008-09 revision process is to align state content standards with the knowledge and skills needed for postsecondary education and the workplace, thereby building upon other key department reform initiatives, such as the American Diploma Project, Partnership for 21st Century Skills and the Secondary Education Initiative.

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.

New Jersey has had science assessments at grades 4 and 8 for several years. In 2006-2007, New Jersey implemented a high school science assessment as well as science assessments in grades 4 and 8. In addition the state's alternate assessment for students with severe cognitive disabilities measured science as well as language arts and mathematics.

RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION:

In 2008, the high school regular and Alternate Proficiency Assessment (APA) science assessments will become end-of-course biology assessments, replacing the integrated science content of the former APA and High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) assessments which were administered operationally for the first time in 2007.

In addition, the state will field test a biology performance assessment prompt to about 90000 students in May 2008 through a cooperative agreement with its grantee the New Jersey Performance Assessment Alliance (NJPA).

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.

There is no change to the current status of academic achievement standards in science.

RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION:

The New Jersey Department of Education is required by state administrative code to review and update the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in all content areas, including science, in a five-year cycle. The primary goal of the 2008-09 revision process is to align state content standards with the knowledge and skills needed for postsecondary education and the workplace, thereby building upon other key department reform initiatives, such as the American Diploma Project, Partnership for 21st Century Skills and the Secondary Education Initiative.

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	736091	731996	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	852	844	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	57820	57719	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	127071	125805	99.0
Hispanic	131524	130741	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	414687	413461	99.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	123797	122547	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22551	22420	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	205025	203517	99.3
Migratory students	229	229	100.0
Male	378283	376268	99.5
Female	357151	355728	99.6
Comments: Some districts did not report gender.			

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	18286	14.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	96730	78.9
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	7531	6.1
Total	122547	
Comments: The number presented is equal to the the number tested.		

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	736091	732312	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	852	845	99.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	57820	57646	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	127071	126139	99.3
Hispanic	131524	130623	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	414687	413670	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	123797	122767	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22551	22105	98.0
Economically disadvantaged students	205025	203700	99.4
Migratory students	229	221	96.5
Male	378283	376475	99.5
Female	357151	355837	99.6
Comments: The NJDOE LAL results were submitted in the N081 file as required. EDEN has reported that another file, N078, is needed to prepopulate this section. The EDEN N078 file was not required, so the data is not prepopulating this section. Please refer to the data in the N081 file.			
Some districts have not reported gender. The 1st year LEP students have the option of testing in LAL.			

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	18314	14.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	96922	78.9
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	7531	6.1
Total	122767	
Comments: The number presented is equal to the number tested.		

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	103611	89744	86.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	80	68	85.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8781	8364	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	17908	12895	72.0
Hispanic	19717	15420	78.2
White, non-Hispanic	56575	52564	92.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16245	11261	69.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4344	2821	64.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31951	23968	75.0
Migratory students	25	17	68.0
Male	53567	46130	86.1
Female	49998	43586	87.2
Comments: The migrant student population is decreasing. American Indian or Alaska Native and Migratory Students: Small populations are impacted by slight changes in population.			

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

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103560	85017	82.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	80	60	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8770	7933	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	17924	12151	67.8
Hispanic	19676	13825	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	56572	50647	89.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16237	9067	55.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4286	1863	43.5
Economically disadvantaged students	31942	21568	67.5
Migratory students	25	13	52.0
Male	53544	42243	78.9
Female	49977	42758	85.6
Comments: The migrant student population is decreasing. American Indian or Alaska Native and Migratory Students: Small populations are impacted by slight changes in population.			

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103255	86615	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	89	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	8588	8083	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	17659	11916	67.5
Hispanic	19408	14379	74.1
White, non-Hispanic	56990	51796	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17081	10568	61.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3735	2033	54.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31111	21968	70.6
Migratory students	34	19	55.9
Male	53171	44443	83.6
Female	50052	42163	84.2
Comments: The migrant student population is decreasing.			

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	103194	81966	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	81	72.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	8574	7711	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17666	10979	62.1
Hispanic	19364	13046	67.4
White, non-Hispanic	56990	49823	87.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17090	8415	49.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3665	1370	37.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31081	19659	63.3
Migratory students	33	23	69.7
Male	53149	40295	75.8
Female	50012	41660	83.3
Comments: The migrant student population is decreasing. The 2006-2007 LEP data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104020	86785	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	80	68	85.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8569	8053	94.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17746	11984	67.5
Hispanic	19019	13927	73.2
White, non-Hispanic	58012	52308	90.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17935	10462	58.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3105	1631	52.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30306	21089	69.6
Migratory students	38	25	65.8
Male	53307	44002	82.5
Female	50591	42722	84.4
Comments: American Indian or Alaska Native: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in population. Children with Disabilities: There was no APA assessment available in 2005-2006 for grades 5, 6, and 7. LEP: The 2006-2007 data has been verified.			

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

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104045	90886	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	80	71	88.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	8563	8056	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	17772	13275	74.7
Hispanic	19004	14552	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	58036	54455	93.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17964	11184	62.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3079	1208	39.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30326	22425	73.9
Migratory students	34	23	67.6
Male	53307	45493	85.3
Female	50616	45320	89.5
Comments: Migratory Students and American Indian or Alaska Native: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in population. Children with Disabilities: There was no APA assessment available in 2005-2006 for grades 5, 6, and 7. . Migratory Students: The 2006-2007 data has been verified.			

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

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

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	105821	82973	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	143	103	72.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8219	7643	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	18312	10438	57.0
Hispanic	19278	13194	68.4
White, non-Hispanic	59111	51052	86.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18017	8512	47.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2868	1420	49.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30808	19200	62.3
Migratory students	36	19	52.8
Male	54534	42201	77.4
Female	51143	40696	79.6
Comments: American Indian and Migrant: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in population.			
In 2005-2006, there was no Alternative Assessments available for grades 5, 6, and 7.			
The second year of testing in grades 5, 6, and 7 occurred in 2007 and produced improved proficiency levels.			

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	105903	79239	74.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	143	100	69.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8214	7197	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	18364	9647	52.5
Hispanic	19279	11132	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	59155	50651	85.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18060	7138	39.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2837	554	19.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30861	16532	53.6
Migratory students	34	15	44.1
Male	54594	39110	71.6
Female	51166	40050	78.3
Comments: American Indian: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in population.			
In 2005-2006, there was no Alternative Assessments available for grades 5, 6, and 7.			
The 2006-2007 data for the LEP has been verified as correct.			
The second year of testing in grades 5, 6, and 7 occurred in 2007 and produced improved proficiency levels.			

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	106887	70459	65.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	67	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	7972	6976	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	18966	7667	40.4
Hispanic	19155	9656	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	60078	45767	76.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18300	5572	30.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2839	985	34.7
Economically disadvantaged students	30124	13597	45.1
Migratory students	40	13	32.5
Male	55066	36146	65.6
Female	51685	34268	66.3

Comments: American Indian and Migrant: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in populations.

Black and White subpopulations: There appears to be an error in the 2005-2006 CSPR. The second year of testing occurred in 2007 and produced improved proficiency levels.

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

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107047	84570	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	113	85	75.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	7963	7194	90.3
Black, non-Hispanic	19063	11335	59.5
Hispanic	19158	12335	64.4
White, non-Hispanic	60147	53218	88.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18362	8312	45.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2805	617	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	30223	18146	60.0
Migratory students	39	17	43.6
Male	55175	41720	75.6
Female	51738	42781	82.7

Comments: American Indian and Migrant: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in populations.

The 2006-2007 data for the LEP has been verified as correct.

The second year of testing occurred in 2007 and produced improved proficiency levels.

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

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

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	108938	74049	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	66	56.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	8067	7015	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	19283	7404	38.4
Hispanic	19049	9581	50.3
White, non-Hispanic	61971	49762	80.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19072	5815	30.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2979	765	25.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29823	13271	44.5
Migratory students	42	20	47.6
Male	56145	38180	68.0
Female	52725	35837	68.0
Comments: The mathematic increases are verified.			
Migratory students: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in population.			

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	108932	78844	72.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	116	77	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	8031	6872	85.6
Black, non-Hispanic	19346	9471	49.0
Hispanic	18990	10621	55.9
White, non-Hispanic	62006	51566	83.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19093	6461	33.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2877	448	15.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29822	15047	50.5
Migratory students	42	15	35.7
Male	56149	36914	65.7
Female	52717	41905	79.5
Comments: Migratory student: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in populations.			

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	100078	72985	72.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	145	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	7523	6734	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	15931	6859	43.1
Hispanic	15115	8380	55.4
White, non-Hispanic	60724	50536	83.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15897	5020	31.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2550	742	29.1
Economically disadvantaged students	19394	9658	49.8
Migratory students	14	<N	
Male	50478	36930	73.2
Female	49534	36026	72.7
Comments: American Indian and Migratory students: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in population. The Economically disadvantaged has lower reliability at the HS level.			

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

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	100235	84893	84.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	156	77.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	7531	6864	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	16004	10953	68.4
Hispanic	15152	10853	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	60764	55659	91.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15961	7764	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2556	636	24.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19445	13197	67.9
Migratory students	14	<N	
Male	50557	41092	81.3
Female	49611	43761	88.2
Comments: American Indian and Migratory students: Small student populations are impacted by slight changes in population. The Economically Disadvantaged has lower reliability at the HS level. LEP math gains are verified.			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	2217	1649	74.4
Districts	622	579	93.1
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	1272	855	67.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	342	151	44.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	930	704	75.7
Comments:			

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
495	450	90.9
Comments: The difference is due to a timing issue. The 0506 CSPR utilized available data from the previous year, including a list of Title 1 districts and preliminary assessment data. An updated final 0506 CSPR determined that the number of Title 1 districts that made AYP is 411.		

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.

Consolidated State Performance Report 2006-2007

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

New Jersey districts and schools apply for their federal entitlement funds using the NCLB Consolidated Subgrant Application. To assist them in this effort the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) issues planning documents annual updates to the NCLB Reference Manual and provides county-based technical assistance trainings. The consolidated application includes the Title I Unified Plan that consists of an annual Title I school improvement plan for schools in need of improvement and a district improvement plan for Title I districts in need of improvement. The Title I Unified Plan also consists of a section where districts describe how they support their low-performing schools. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/grants/entitlement/nclb/titleunifiedplanfinal.doc>

In addition to the Title I Unified Plan a governance plan must be completed for Title I schools identified in Year 5 (planning to restructure) and submitted to the SEA. The plan is implemented by Title I schools in Years 6 and 7 of improvement. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/accountability/restructure.doc>

On an annual basis before the start of school all districts and schools are notified of their adequate yearly progress (AYP) and improvement status. Title I districts and schools are informed of the federal sanctions for the associated year of improvement. The AYP and yearly status charts are posted on the NJDOE Web site and are public information. Districts are also mailed the AYP chart (s) that includes the specific subgroup assessment data used. In addition to this chart a three-year state assessment trend chart is mailed for each school and district. All districts and schools have an opportunity to use these data to inform their decision-making. These data are especially important for struggling districts and schools as they hone in on root causes and evaluate intervention efforts.

NCLB State System of Support

The NJDOE provides ongoing formal and informal assistance to districts and schools that takes many forms.

Five training modules have been developed and are available to districts and schools. These modules are presented live by department staff or accessed on-line. The five modules cover the following topics: Title I Program Manager School Improvement Accountability Parental Involvement and Teacher Training. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/tech/>

Ongoing technical assistance is also provided to schools and districts in need of improvement to aid them in the parental notification process public school choice option and supplemental educational services (SES) requirements. This technical assistance is provided directly by NJDOE staff. The Title I Office staff provides guidance to the department field offices as well as directly to schools districts and SES providers.

Policy letters sample parental notification letters and a Supplemental Educational Services Toolkit have been developed and available on-line. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/>

The NJDOE in partnership with the New Jersey Association of Federal Program Administrators (NJAFPA) provides two regional trainings and an annual three-day institute.

NJDOE county and Abbott office staff are included in pertinent conferences and trainings and are available to consult on an individual basis with districts and schools.

The Title I Office maintains a helpline to enable districts and schools to contact the office directly with questions.

An extensive Title I Web site is maintained to provide documents data and other reference material for use by districts.

The NCLB Reference Manual is continually updated to ensure current and complete support information is available to districts.

The NCLB school support team process Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement (CAPA) provides on-the-scene review consultation and follow-up to schools in improvement status. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/capa/>

The state monitoring system New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (NJQSAC) is coordinated with the state's NCLB accountability efforts.

Title I Committee of Practitioners

Since February 2004 New Jersey's Committee of Practitioners, the NCLB School Improvement Committee, has met bimonthly to inform and guide the development of policy relating to the NCLB provisions for Title I schools and districts in need of improvement. The committee is composed of representatives from districts in need of improvement and high-performing districts members of the state's education associations and bargaining units representatives from institutions of higher education and staff from the various divisions within the NJDOE. The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center (MACC) one of the 21 federally funded technical assistance centers is also a member of this committee. MACC has been instrumental in assisting and guiding the state's improvement efforts.

At these meetings districts with schools in need of improvement share their strategies of intervention with each other conducting formal presentations highlighting their efforts. These sessions are also used to share overall NCLB efforts that support school improvement. MACC also presents its ongoing analyses of New Jersey's federal school improvement initiatives.

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	86
Extension of the school year or school day	11
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	28
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	47
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	33
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	25
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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)	51
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	25
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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.

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

Districts in Need of Improvement

Title I districts identified as in need of improvement under NCLB also receive local capacity building services from the NJDOE. The types of services reflect the district improvement continuum as outlined in federal guidance. Building federal accountability into the state's monitoring system districts in the third year of federal corrective action status (DINI-Year 3) are monitored using NJQSAC. MACC and Montclair University assisted the state in coordinating the federal intervention effort with NJQSAC.

The state continues this work with Title I districts in the fourth year of district improvement status (DINI-Year 4) including the application of the federal corrective action that are consistent with state law. MACC and the Education Alliance at Brown University are assisting the state in a district strategic mapping process. Distraction from NJQSAC reviews are being compiled to identify indicators that correspond to high performance. The Education Alliance is working with the state under their USDE-Funding grant the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Support and Capacity Building Program.

NCLB School Support Teams

As required by section 1117 the NJDOE has established school support teams also known as CAPA teams to work with Title I schools in need of improvement. With the input of the NCLB School Improvement Committee and the approval of the full NCLB Advisory Council a percentage of the LEAs' program improvement funds [section 1003(a)] have been redirected and devoted to funding NJDOE's school support teams. This enables CAPA teams to serve a greater number of Title I schools in need of improvement each year and to provide follow-up support for schools in advanced levels of improvement. The NCLB Advisory Council has approved a redirection of 1003(a) funds for the past three years.

CAPA teams consist of NJDOE staff consultants and district and school staff. District staff serve as partners on CAPA teams in an effort to build local capacity to oversee their low-performing schools. Their participation serves as a tool for professional learning to introduce and reinforce successful research-based practices. The CAPA process (the initial on-site visit the annual Benchmark Assessments and the follow-up on-site three-day visit) is designed to assist schools as follows:

- Conduct an initial comprehensive review and needs assessment of all facets of a school's operation. District operations are also evaluated during the initial visit.

- Review state-issued AYP and three-year trend data charts along with other school portfolio information to inform the CAPA team during the school review effort also known as the scholastic audit.

- Issue a report to the district that identifies findings and recommendations at the conclusion of the on-site visit. The district presents this report to the school staff and the public at a School Board meeting. The NJDOE posts all the CAPA reports on its Web site.

After the CAPA report is issued the school/district update the Title I Unified Plan incorporating its prioritized CAPA recommendations to address the identified issues. The prioritized issues are specified and an action plan and budget are developed that includes student achievement data benchmarks and targets as well as a plan of action using scientifically based research models.

- Conduct three-annual Benchmark Assessments. The NJDOE continues to support districts and schools that have undergone CAPA reviews to assist in the process of implementing CAPA recommendations. Each school/district participates in three annual follow-up meetings called Benchmark Assessments to discuss the level of implementation of its school improvement plan that includes the status of the CAPA prioritized recommendations. The NJDOE is responsible for scheduling and conducting these follow-up technical assistance meetings. Collaboration and capacity building in all phases related to the implementation of the CAPA recommendations are the primary principles guiding this support. The Benchmark Assessment process includes a three-day on-site visit for schools in Year 6 (Implementation of Restructuring).

In the last three years 230 Title I schools received a CAPA visit of these 56 schools received a second visit two years after their initial review.

Since the CAPA program was launched in 2004-2005 the review tool and protocols have been updated annually based on review and analysis of current research. This year's effort included several months of work with MACC. The CAPA standards and

indications were cross-walked with the research done by Robert Marzano in his book *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action*.

MACC assisted the state in comparing performance level ratings of the two reviews for the 56 schools in Year 6 (Implementation of Restructuring) in 2006-2007. The ratings used were the 1-4 point scoring rubric of the CAPA review tool which has nine standards and 19 indicators. These schools all had CAPA visits in 2004-2005 and three-day CAPA follow-up visits in 2006-2007. The scores on the CAPA standards and indicators were compared from these two CAPA visits to track the schools' progress in implementing their strategies. The study found that schools made significant gains in every CAPA indicator. Gains ranged from 10 points to a high of 30 points. The results are promising evidence that schools are making progress.

Year 5 Schools (Planning to Restructure)

To assist districts with schools entering Year 5 the NJDOE sponsors a series of technical assistance sessions. This year Seton Hall University is co-hosting two of the four sessions. Districts and schools are invited to participate in an information session on the legislative requirements for Year 5 schools and the planning process to identify an appropriate restructuring option. The session includes a presentation on the implementation of restructuring efforts across the nation and a workshop on using data for each student in the classroom to identify strengths and weaknesses and ways to plan for needed interventions. Promising practices are also shared with the district and school staff. These technical assistance sessions also guide districts through the components of the restructuring plan by providing an overview of the federal sanctions. Restructuring plans are submitted to the NJDOE for review and approval. For certain schools additional meetings are held to further articulate the plan for alternate governance. Follow-up data analysis trainings are then held to aid schools in using data to inform instruction. These are ongoing and feature experts from high-performing districts.

Year 6 Schools (Implementation of Restructuring)

For schools in Year 6 more intensive follow-up occurs. One of the three annual CAPA Benchmark Assessments includes a three-day on-site visit by a CAPA team. These visits are individually designed to focus on the fidelity of implementation of schools' improvement and restructuring plans and to determine next steps. This work was guided by the research of Victoria Bernhardt found in *Using Data to Improve Student Learning in School Districts*. These on-site school visits occur in the second semester of the restructuring school year. During the visits the team interviews staff observes classrooms and reviews documentation. This report is compared to the initial CAPA report that was completed two years before to assess the level of improvement on the CAPA standards and indicators. A report is then issued to the district/school.

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: NJDOE's remedy is to appoint a highly skilled professional - Total districts 12	

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	4/24/07	4/23/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	10/13/06	8/4/06
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	4	2
Schools	19	4
Comments:		

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	12/06/07
---	----------

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.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

The 1003(a) funds are allocated to all Title I schools in need of improvement regardless of the year of status. Funds are allocated using a formula: the number of poverty students in the school. The NCLB School Improvement Committee supports this allocation method since it provides all Title I schools in need of improvement with funds to implement improvement efforts. This is a proactive approach for schools in early levels of improvement giving them opportunities to implement strategies as soon as they are designated for improvement. A portion of the 95% of LEA funds are redirected to the NJDOE to directly provide the school support team services of CAPA.

An amount representing 5% of the total award is retained for SEA use. In addition to these 1003(a) state-level funds the NJDOE is retaining \$750000 of the LEA portion. The Committee of Practitioners (NCLB Advisory Council) approved this amount in accordance with the NCLB legislation section 1003(b)(2). The 1003(a) funds at the SEA level are used for two FTEs that include the CAPA manager and coordinator as well as the related costs of data analysis workshops technical assistance sessions and evaluation/monitoring efforts for the CAPA process. Redirected 1003(a) funds (\$750000) are used for the CAPA school support teams that work directly with the schools and districts on improvement efforts. These 1003(a) funds will continue to be used for these purposes.

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	87
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	81
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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	155920
Who applied to transfer	1236
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	842

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>No</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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	\$ 98807
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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	
Comments: NJ is not currently collecting this data, it will be included in the 2009 collection.	

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	328
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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	122926
Who applied for supplemental educational services	21050
Who received supplemental educational services	16732
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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	\$ 19776042
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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	301476	297909	98.8	3567	1.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	32907	32188	97.8	719	2.2
Low-poverty schools	26617	26183	98.4	434	1.6
All elementary schools	179538	177509	98.9	2029	1.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	16579	16110	97.2	469	2.8
Low-poverty schools	19623	19437	99.1	186	0.9
All secondary schools	121938	120400	98.7	1538	1.3
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.

Elementary classes are counted 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	
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	
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	

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)	
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	
<p>Comments: Data on reasons classes are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified were not collected by the state in 2006-2007. The state will collect these data through new federally required district Highly Qualified Plans that will be operational early in 2008. These plans will be linked to the Certificated Staff Report the state's data system which includes the names of all teachers who are not highly qualified in the area(s) they are teaching.</p>	

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	50.7	5.3
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch Quartiles used are same as FAQ (a).	
Secondary schools	38.2	5.3
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch Quartiles used are same as FAQ(a).	
<p>Comments: The State of New Jersey rank-ordered the elementary schools (K-8) and the secondary schools (9-12) separately. The identified break point for the high poverty and low poverty quartiles. The percent of students on free/reduced lunch for the four break point schools are as follows:</p> <p>Elementary high-poverty: 50.7% low-poverty: 5.3%</p> <p>Secondary high-poverty: 38.2% low-poverty: 5.3%</p> <p>Oddly enough the elementary and secondary match on the low-poverty. There are only about 340 high schools, so it is a small group compared to the elementary that includes all the middle range.</p>		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
14	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
0	Two-way immersion	Spanish	0.0	0.0
49	Transitional bilingual	Spanish Korean Polish Mandarin Haitian Creole Portuguese Guiarati	80.0	20.0
15	Developmental bilingual	Spanish	50.0	50.0
1	Heritage language	Spanish	90.0	10.0
69	Sheltered English instruction			
60	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
78	Content-based ESL			
168	Pull-out ESL			
38	Other (explain)			

Comments: Zero is indicated in the Number Using Program and the Percentage Language of Instruction columns because New Jersey combines dual language and two-way immersion into one on our data collection instrument.

Zero is also indicated in the SDAIE program because New Jersey combines Structured English Immersion and SDAIE into one on our data collection instrument.

Transitional Bilingual Program: % Language of Instruction: Year 1 - English: 20% OLOI: 80%; Year 2 - English: 50% OLOI: 50%; and Year 3 - English: 80% OLOI: 20%.

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.	54433
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	42818
Korean	1611
Arabic	1516
Portuguese	1444
Guiarati	1083

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the 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	54222
Not tested/State annual ELP	211
Subtotal	54433
LEP/One Data Point	29375
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: The 1.6.3.1.1 total is for all LEP students and 1.6.3.1.2 is only Title III funded districts.	

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	52679
Not tested/State annual ELP	207
Subtotal	52886
LEP/One Data Point	28062
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: The 1.6.3.1.1 total is for all LEP students and 1.6.3.1.2 is only Title III funded districts.	

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	65.0	18519	77.0	Y
No progress		5381		
ELP attainment	65.0	51800	96.0	Y

Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: The # of LEP with ELP reflects the number of students in the state that are in programs within the 4 or 5 year timeframe or who have excited after being in programs less then the target timeframe in language assistance programs.

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: Checked "YES" in SEC 1.6.3.2.1 so state does not need to complete this section.				

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	
MFLEP/AYP grades	9539
Comments: The actual total MFLEP data is not available at this time.	
RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: The 1.6.3.4.3 total is for all MFLEP students and 1.6.3.6.1 is Title III served MFLEP.	

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:

- LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.
- 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).
- 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	22213
LEP HS/Non-AYP	8968
LEP other grades	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: Checked "NO" in sec 1.6.3.5.1 so state does not need to complete.	

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

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

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: Checked "NO" in 1.6.3.5.1 so State does not need to complete.		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: Checked "NO" in 1.6.3.5.1 so State does not need to complete.		

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
4768	4328	9096
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: The 1.6.3.4.3 total is for all MFLEP students and 1.6.3.6.1 is Title III served MFLEP.		

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
9539	6700	70.2	2839

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: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: The 1.6.3.6.2 total is for all MFLEP students and 1.6.3.6.1 is MFLEP served in Title III districts for Math

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
9539	6324	66.3	3215

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: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: The 1.6.3.6.3 total is for all MFLEP students and 1.6.3.6.1 is MFLEP served in Title III districts for LAL

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	212
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	193
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	19
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	19
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	18
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments: This represents the number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs based on the 2004-06 school years. Only one subgrantee of those 18 did not meet the AMAOs in 2006-07.	

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
36639	11355	60

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>Yes</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>Yes</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

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

Comments: There is one multi-year competitive grant that has been awarded. The rest are awarded on an annual formula basis.

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.	3751
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.	3875
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	200

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	44	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	212	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	212	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	14	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	44	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	38	78
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	149	388
PD provided to principals	13	20
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	175	433
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	26	57
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	0	0
Total		976
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data.		

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
07/01/06	11/20/06	112
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

The state can expedite the approval process by allowing funds to be released to districts when their application is judged to be in "substantially approvable form."

RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION:(proposed dates)

-NCLB applications due August 30, 2008

-NJDOE completes the review by October 31, 2008

-Funds would be made available as of November 1, 2008, pending district's return of the GAC;

-Impose a 60-day deadline on the return of the Grant Acceptance Certificate(GAC).(Allow LEAs 60 days to return the GACs because of board meeting date issues)

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

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	92.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	90.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	97.0
Black, non-Hispanic	87.0
Hispanic	84.9
White, non-Hispanic	95.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	77.7
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	91.4
Female	93.7

Comments: The American Indian or Alaska Native population is so small that any change in the population has a significant impact on the graduation rate. Graduation rate is not currently collected for the following subgroups: Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged and Migratory. Additional racial/ethnic groups or combination of racial/ethnic groups may be reported are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

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	1.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3.3
Hispanic	3.3
White, non-Hispanic	1.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0.5
Limited English proficient	0.1
Economically disadvantaged	0.5
Migratory students	0.0
Male	2.1
Female	1.5
Comments: The data is self reported. Dropout rate is not currently collected for the Migratory student subpopulation (denoted as 0.0). Additional racial/ethnic groups or combination of racial/ethnic groups may be reported are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

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	659	552
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	667	560
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)	55	108
K	280	126
1	306	104
2	266	136
3	247	112
4	224	101
5	207	102
6	227	91
7	234	100
8	200	103
9	250	81
10	198	48
11	171	41
12	136	25
Ungraded	0	0
Total	3001	1278
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	504	689
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1972	522
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	25	<N
Hotels/Motels	500	65
Total	3001	
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)	108
K	126
1	104
2	136
3	112
4	101
5	102
6	91
7	100
8	103
9	81
10	48
11	41
12	25
Ungraded	0
Total	1278
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	13
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	71
Limit English proficient students	19
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	8
2. Expedited evaluations	2
3. Staff professional development and awareness	8
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
5. Transportation	6
6. Early childhood programs	6
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	4
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	7
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	5
12. Counseling	6
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	5
15. School supplies	6
16. Referral to other programs and services	6
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	0
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	1
2. School Selection	2
3. Transportation	2
4. School records	1
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	1
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	77	32
4	83	39
5	92	44
6	70	23
7	89	32
8	91	27
High School	35	20
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	84	38
4	82	39
5	93	34
6	71	26
7	88	31
8	93	18
High School	37	<N
Comments:		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the 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)	124
K	85
1	92
2	92
3	88
4	83
5	60
6	54
7	40
8	42
9	32
10	24
11	21
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	1489
Total	2337
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data	

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.

N/A

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)	83
K	55
1	57
2	56
3	46
4	44
5	30
6	25
7	19
8	18
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	822
Total	1274
Comments: RESPONSE TO PART I VERIFICATION: Updated data.	

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.

N/A

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

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

1.10.3 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.

New Jersey used COEstar to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting year. The child counts for the last reporting period were also generated using COEstar.

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.

Data collected relevant to the Childcount includes: the COE (4 specific elements: the QAD residency, date, current address/state and student's date of birth); school or program enrollment including the school term school year enrollment and withdrawal dates from the program; LEP assessment needs assessment and graduation/termination data; and instructional and supportive services program data including the type of program and funding source.

Recruiters collect data at the time a new COE is completed. Formal mailings are made to the school districts requesting additional information such as enrollment verification supplemental program participation special education data updated health records test scores promotion data completion of at-risk surveys etc. For students entering the area after mass enrollment is completed in the fall the local regional projects contact school districts to verify enrollment For pre-schoolers not attending a school or program and for non-attending young adults lists are generated by district and are given to the appropriate recruiter for verification. The recruiter then calls or visits the homes of the children/youth in order to verify that they still reside in the area. All data relating to summer services are documented through daily attendance records tutor logs nurse's health logs reports and receipts for services staff monthly reports and activity logs health referral forms pre-and post-test records summaries of student progress instructional service according to what each site provided and what each child actually received. Site directors student records clerks nurses recruiters teachers and other summer staff are involved in collecting maintaining and forwarding these data to the data management specialist for recording in the database.

COEstar is an integrated component of our data collection system and data is collected throughout the entire year.

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

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

In the space below, 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.

COEstar is our primary filing system for student information from the COE to the collection of services. Although data are inputted both manually and through electronic COEs no data is entered into our database until the COE is verified by the regional migrant education project director. COEstar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to provide the Childcount and additional reports for the Performance Report submitted by the New Jersey Department of Education.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children who were between age 3 through 21

As a result COEstar's ability to keep electronic copies of the official state Certificate of Eligibility all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the accounts are performed. Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edits checks on data as it is entered the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of test on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source.

As COEstar keeps a copy of the actual COE calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he/she can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility).

By virtue of completing a COE the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulations. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.

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

-Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were within 3 years of a last qualifying move had a qualifying activity);

The information collected by the recruiter through the interview process and recorded on the COE is verified by the program director prior to being entered in the COEstar database and monitored by TROMIK.

-Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);

TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to confirm that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would verify that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the school year listed on the school enrollment records QAD dates residency dates enrollment dates withdrawal dates departure dates needs assessment and graduation/termination dates special services dates and health record dates performed in this state during the period.

-Children who in the case of Category 2-received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Entry of this data means that the State served during the summer/intersession term. Additionally services information can be added to indicate the nature of services; however the summer/intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service begins.

-Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

COEstar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state region county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level eligible children are counted only once statewide in each eligible category. Upon the process of data entry at the regional level the data specialist scans the consolidated data base to look for duplicates. Prior to student information being added to the COEstar system a search is conducted to determine whether the student record already exists. In the instance a duplicate is found the record is not entered into the data base. Additionally all COEs are thoroughly inspected and reviewed by the regional program director as an ongoing practice to ensure quality assurance.

Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in School wide programs and TAS programs funded by MEP in both regular and summer/intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to verify that children included in the two Childcounts meet the eligibility criteria (according to 34 CFR22.40) all COEs are reviewed and approved by regional project directors before data is entered into the student information system. For children enrolled in a prior year but still eligible to be counted safeguards are built into the COEstar system to ensure that no child is counted who reached end of eligibility prior to the beginning of the service period. As part of mass enrollment lists of preschoolers and non-attending young adults are generated and recruiters must verify by home visit or telephone that these children and youth are still residing in the area as of September 1. Training is provided to data managers/specialists by their respective program directors. In addition the New Jersey Department of Education's contract with TROMICK Technology includes extensive and ongoing training and technical assistance to the regional subgrantees in the area of data collection. The COE is a standard document used by our MEP subgrantees in both the northern and southern regions of the state which allows a level of conformity between the two regions and throughout the state. Finally the state has provided written guidance on eligibility; which is reviewed annually and reinforced during trainings and monitors the regional migrant programs which includes conducting random audits of COEs and migrant lists for eligibility determinations.

*We should note that COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Once verified each COE can be marked as verified and locked; invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process.

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

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

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.

NJ conducted re-interviews and eligibility determinations of 100 students counted as eligible in the 2005-06 school year.

A stratified random sample of New Jersey's migrant population was drawn from our COEstar data base with assistance from TROMIK Technology.

The random sample reflected the following state profile:

-Approximately 25% of New Jersey's migrant population is settled out with 75% present during the summer/intersession period.

-Greater than 90% of New Jersey's migrant population is served by our Region I program in southern part of the state.

The re-interviewers employed for these activities received orientation and training (facilitated by an ESCORT consultant) needed to develop skills for a precise and accurate re-interview process. Training included testing on a myriad of eligibility determination factors determinations with varying levels of complexity and the opportunity to conduct "sample" re-interviews and have determinations reviewed for accuracy.

Our re-interview protocol was based on practices successfully used by other states to govern the actual process. Similarly the re-interview form itself was derived from existing documents and aligned to easily reference the prior year's COE. This protocol was finalized and subsequently highlighted in the re-interview orientation/training.

The NJ MEP's information systems manager TROMIK Technology Corporation drew a random sample of 500 student names to target as interview subjects from its database of COEs.

Copies of each selected certificate were retained by the MEP coordinator for distribution to the appropriate re-interview staff member once their subjects had been identified. The plan to provide for subsequent distributions of COEs did not take place due to the significantly lower than expected number of subjects found to re-interview due to the program office's inability to hire re-interviewers prior to July 30 2007.

The re-interviews were conducted from July 30 2007 through November 30 2007.

At the end of each week during the re-interview period re-interview staff submitted the gathered information to the State MEP coordinator. Responses were disaggregated as either (1) Clearly continued eligibility (2) Clearly ineligible or (3) findings requiring further clarification. "Follow up" determinations for category three students were not necessary but were arranged to be conducted by the State coordinator in consultation with a group of previously selected MEP colleagues [from other states] until a final resolution was made for each case.

The NJ MEP is currently finalizing our final report for submission to the Office of Migrant Education by January 1 2008.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New Jersey Department of Education is committed to ensuring that its system of data collection is reliable and accurate. Measures to ensure the integrity of data collection for the Migrant Education Program specifically the Childcount Data will be scrutinized at the highest level. Checks and balances have and will continue to be incorporated into this process through a comprehensive system to include: appropriate ID&R training random audits of COEs and the quarterly review of all regional MEP data by the migrant director and state coordinator.

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.

As mentioned previously New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process. Finally SFA staff review and verify all counts with the regional project directors/project staff and TROMIK for accuracy prior to submission to ED.

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.

In addition to the quality control procedures that are currently being utilized the NJ Migrant Education Program staff will thoroughly review the results of the re-interview results to determine what if any corrective actions or improvements need to be made. The program office will continue to hold mandatory bi-annual ID/R trainings along with the regular practice of random record audits and an on-going system of re-interviewing. The New Jersey Migrant Education Program remains committed to accurate recruitment practices consistent with OME guidelines. We are optimistic that the results of the re-interview process will demonstrate that our recruitment efforts are in fact effective and appropriate.

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.

N/A

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

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