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

ALASKA

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

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

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Address:
PO Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Margaret MacKinnon

Telephone: 907-465-2970

Fax: 907-465-2989

e-mail: margaret.mackinnon@alaska.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Margaret MacKinnon

_____　　　　_Friday, March 7, 2008, 12:28:38 AM_
　Signature　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned at this time.

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.

In 2006-2007 the state implemented a new alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. The assessment was reviewed and received peer review approval in the fall of 2007.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In May 2007 the state conducted standard setting on the newly implemented alternate assessment of alternate achievement standards. The state board took action to approve the new standards in the July 2007 and the assessment and the process for adopting the standards was approved through the peer review process. The state TAC recommended the state conduct a standards validation in the spring of 2008 to ensure the cut scores are appropriately placed because this was a new assessment and it has new achievement standards. The state intends to conduct the validation study but it may not necessitate a change in the achievement standards.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state field tested the science test in April 2007. In the fall of 2007 the state conducted an alignment study. In April 2008 the state will administer the first operational form of the science assessment in grades 4 8 and 10. The state will also be implementing an alternate assessment in science at the same grade levels during the spring of 2008.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The standard setting which will provide the information necessary for the state board to adopt academic achievement standards in science and alternate academic achievement standards in science will be conducted in May 2008 and the state expects the board to take action to adopt standards in July 2008.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	78251	76434	97.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	19608	18990	96.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	5213	5122	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3195	3122	97.7
Hispanic	3152	3080	97.7
White, non-Hispanic	43730	42797	97.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10436	10124	97.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11647	11351	97.5
Economically disadvantaged students	31581	30812	97.6
Migratory students	4935	4830	97.9
Male	40135	39220	97.7
Female	38116	37214	97.6
Comments: Multiracial is a category collected by AK. Because it is not yet an option in N081 file specs, subtotals will be greater than the sum of the ethnic categories. The number of multiracial students is 3323.			

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	2180	21.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7400	73.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	544	5.4
Total	10124	
Comments:		

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	78251	76916	98.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	19608	19172	97.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	5213	5085	97.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3195	3141	98.3
Hispanic	3152	3069	97.4
White, non-Hispanic	43730	43106	98.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10436	10208	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11647	11330	97.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31581	30975	98.1
Migratory students	4935	4860	98.5
Male	40135	39435	98.3
Female	38116	37481	98.3
Comments:			

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	2180	21.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7485	73.3
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	543	5.3
Total	10208	
Comments:		

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9199	7228	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2399	1511	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	592	474	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	360	260	72.2
Hispanic	398	303	76.1
White, non-Hispanic	4896	4244	86.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1455	793	54.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1568	901	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4231	2941	69.5
Migratory students	543	350	64.5
Male	4679	3679	78.6
Female	4520	3549	78.5
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in th 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the category Black, non-hispanic to greater than 10%.			

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

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9246	7221	78.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2407	1448	60.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	587	475	80.9
Black, non-Hispanic	361	280	77.6
Hispanic	398	316	79.4
White, non-Hispanic	4937	4255	86.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1457	707	48.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1562	873	55.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4241	2892	68.2
Migratory students	543	333	61.3
Male	4692	3502	74.6
Female	4554	3719	81.7
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in th 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the category Black, non-hispanic to greater than 10%.			

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9319	7037	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2293	1333	58.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	615	491	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	407	276	67.8
Hispanic	347	249	71.8
White, non-Hispanic	5128	4296	83.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1394	638	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1501	777	51.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4108	2670	65.0
Migratory students	555	336	60.5
Male	4805	3556	74.0
Female	4514	3481	77.1
Comments: AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the category Hispanic to greater than 10% loss. In 2007 District were able to more accurately report their populations including the category multi-ethnic.			

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	9352	7466	79.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2303	1398	60.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	604	496	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	411	311	75.7
Hispanic	346	261	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	5161	4575	88.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1402	674	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1486	794	53.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4110	2849	69.3
Migratory students	559	351	62.8
Male	4821	3637	75.4
Female	4531	3829	84.5
Comments: AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the category Hispanic to greater than 10% loss. In 2007 District were able to more accurately report their populations including the category multi-ethnic.			

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	9254	7101	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2341	1412	60.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	606	481	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	363	235	64.7
Hispanic	404	298	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	5071	4306	84.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1370	606	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1433	745	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3978	2650	66.6
Migratory students	592	375	63.3
Male	4752	3590	75.6
Female	4502	3511	78.0
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: economically disadvantaged, migrant, male, IDEA populations.			

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	9279	7266	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2360	1369	58.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	599	482	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	364	268	73.6
Hispanic	400	315	78.8
White, non-Hispanic	5085	4449	87.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1380	616	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1430	692	48.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3978	2683	67.5
Migratory students	598	355	59.4
Male	4768	3507	73.6
Female	4511	3759	83.3
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: economically disadvantaged, migrant, male, IDEA 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.

1.3.7 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	9461	7044	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2273	1309	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	631	504	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	402	236	58.7
Hispanic	381	271	71.1
White, non-Hispanic	5338	4381	82.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1272	495	38.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1449	737	50.9
Economically disadvantaged students	3950	2506	63.4
Migratory students	568	334	58.8
Male	4861	3531	72.6
Female	4600	3513	76.4

Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA populations.

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	9482	7274	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2285	1254	54.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	622	479	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	401	284	70.8
Hispanic	378	289	76.5
White, non-Hispanic	5360	4614	86.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1273	490	38.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1438	663	46.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3947	2549	64.6
Migratory students	567	311	54.9
Male	4869	3497	71.8
Female	4613	3777	81.9

Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA 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.

1.3.9 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	9766	6704	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2380	1182	49.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	679	514	75.7
Black, non-Hispanic	402	230	57.2
Hispanic	384	243	63.3
White, non-Hispanic	5543	4283	77.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1226	322	26.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1399	596	42.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3972	2227	56.1
Migratory students	611	326	53.4
Male	5009	3327	66.4
Female	4757	3377	71.0
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: female, economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA populations.			

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

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9804	7365	75.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2396	1273	53.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	672	521	77.5
Black, non-Hispanic	402	280	69.7
Hispanic	381	284	74.5
White, non-Hispanic	5571	4733	85.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1236	379	30.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1390	615	44.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3984	2495	62.6
Migratory students	613	362	59.1
Male	5025	3488	69.4
Female	4779	3877	81.1
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: female, economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA 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.

1.3.11 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	9716	6720	69.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2402	1222	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	678	512	75.5
Black, non-Hispanic	406	238	58.6
Hispanic	424	284	67.0
White, non-Hispanic	5450	4237	77.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1196	342	28.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1425	624	43.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3898	2196	56.3
Migratory students	633	335	52.9
Male	5030	3459	68.8
Female	4686	3261	69.6

Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA populations.

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	9769	7739	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2418	1426	59.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	672	556	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	406	306	75.4
Hispanic	422	333	78.9
White, non-Hispanic	5491	4839	88.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1207	442	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1423	736	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3916	2647	67.6
Migratory students	635	370	58.3
Male	5064	3745	74.0
Female	4705	3994	84.9

Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA 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	19719	12954	65.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4902	2296	46.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1321	909	68.8
Black, non-Hispanic	782	376	48.1
Hispanic	742	413	55.7
White, non-Hispanic	11371	8587	75.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2211	534	24.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2576	980	38.0
Economically disadvantaged students	6675	3310	49.6
Migratory students	1328	680	51.2
Male	10084	6586	65.3
Female	9635	6368	66.1
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: male, female, economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA populations.			

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

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	19984	15746	78.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	5003	3111	62.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1329	1040	78.3
Black, non-Hispanic	796	559	70.2
Hispanic	744	524	70.4
White, non-Hispanic	11501	10037	87.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2253	830	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2601	1270	48.8
Economically disadvantaged students	6799	4434	65.2
Migratory students	1345	878	65.3
Male	10196	7536	73.9
Female	9788	8210	83.9
Comments: Alaska had a decrease in population of students in the 2006-2007 school year. This combined with AK's introduction of the ethnicity category Multi-Ethnic changed our concentration of students in the many of the other ethnic categories. This change in the population is reflected in many of the sub group categories including: male, female, economically disadvantaged, migrant, IDEA 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.

1.4 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	498	328	65.9
Districts	54	30	55.6
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do 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	279	182	65.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	121	66	54.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	158	116	73.4
Comments:			

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

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
51	27	52.9
Comments: The number of districts that receive Title I funds is higher than reported through EDEN due to Alaska's approved use of alternative data for districts with less than 20,000 population and because the state boarding school is treated as a district.		

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.

Alaska requires each district to submit school improvement plans for all of its Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Those plans are reviewed and technical assistance is provided to districts for those schools. Recommendations are provided for improvement in the plans. Technical assistance audio conferences are held to discuss requirements of school improvement plans and strategies for improvement. Schools in corrective action must include a corrective action component in their school improvement plan. Districts with schools in restructuring must submit a separate alternative governance plan at the end of the first year in restructuring. The department presents information on requirements for corrective action and restructuring by audio conference and at roundtable presentations at the annual NCLB conference. The department provides technical assistance and suggestions upon reviews of the corrective action and restructuring plans. An Instructional Audit Tool has been developed in collaboration with the Alaska Comprehensive Center. It was used by teams visiting schools on-site to gather information upon which to make recommendations for changes to positively impact student achievement. Visits have been made to schools in 5 of the lowest performing districts. Information gathered from the instructional audits in those schools was used to create requirements for progress monitoring and formative assessments that the districts must implement.

In order to expand and maximize the statewide system of support, Alaska has developed a tri-tiered support system for schools and districts that begins with the Universal Access level (Tier 1) for all districts and schools. At Tier 1, information and training is available to all districts and schools through resources on the department website. A major focus of the annual Winter Conference held in January each year is to provide training in using data to drive instructional decisions, aligning curriculum to standards, using formative assessments aligned to state standards, and other components of the RTI framework. Additional topic specific professional development such as Response to Instruction & Intervention training has been provided to selected districts and made available to others as space allowed. The Targeted Access level (Tier 2), allows those districts identified at Level 2 or 3 (Improvement under NCLB section 1116), to access additional resources such as more specific trainings to further support and guide their improvement efforts. The Intervention Access level (Tier 3), allows districts identified at Level 4 (Corrective Action under NCLB section 1116), access to a District Improvement Coach and further specific training in leadership, assessment and curriculum. The tiers are described below.

Tier 1 - Universal Access

Provide all districts with technical assistance to close the achievement gaps in reading, math and sub-group performance. The assistance available from the department is: Alignment of curriculum to Alaska Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations; Standards Based Assessments and High School Graduation Qualifying Exam test item mapping and blueprints; Utilizing data to guide instruction; Response to Instruction/Intervention (RTI) Model; Formative Assessments - Alaska Computerized Formative Assessments, GLE Item Sampler, Anchorage School District Formative Assessment Item Bank; Professional Development for teachers - instructional strategies, intervention strategies; and Site and district leadership training.

Tier 2 - Targeted Access

Districts at Level 2 or above (Improvement) are provided with more directed technical assistance. This technical assistance is more directed and specific to the district needs. The following is assistance available from the department: Suggested formative assessment (Curriculum Based Measures - CBMs) to monitor progress and provide data to guide instruction; Site leadership training; and Consultation and online suggestions for school and district improvement planning.

Tier 3 - Intervention Access

Provide districts at Level 4 (Corrective Action) in most need of support with structured detailed technical assistance. The assistance available from the department is: Formative assessment system (CBMs); Site specific professional development - curriculum, leadership and instruction; Work with a District Improvement Coach to promote improved academic achievement; and Professional development in data based decision making, progress monitoring, formative assessments, and teacher collaboration meetings.

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	15
Extension of the school year or school day	6
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	25
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Alaska requires districts identified for improvement and corrective action to submit district improvement plans for review and approval by the department. Those plans are reviewed and technical assistance is provided to districts. Recommendations are provided for improvement in the plans. Technical assistance audio conferences are held to discuss requirements of district improvement plans and strategies for improvement. Presentations on using data to drive instructional decisions and on using formative assessments aligned to state standards have been by audio conference and at major state conferences.

When a district reaches the level of corrective action, the department performs a desk audit of available data, including student achievement and AYP data. As warranted, a team is sent to a district to provide on-site training and technical assistance in analyzing data and making instructional changes to improve student achievement. Based on the desk audit of student achievement data, selected schools receive an on-site visit by an Instructional Audit Team.

The department worked in collaboration with the Alaska Comprehensive Center and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory to develop an Instructional Audit Tool that is used by an on-site review team to identify a school's strengths and challenges. Following training in the instructional audit process, teams of Alaskan educators visit schools in corrective action or restructuring to examine documents, observe classroom instruction and interview teachers, administrators and students. Their work is guided by the Instructional Audit Tool which focuses on six domains relevant to school improvement planning: curriculum, instruction, assessment, school learning environment, professional development and leadership. While the development of the audit tool and the on-site instructional audit process has been led by the Alaska Comprehensive Center, the department will be taking a greater role in using this process to identify areas of need and ways to provide support to schools and districts in corrective action and restructuring.

To date, schools have been visited in 5 of the lowest-performing districts. Information gathered from the on-site visits was used to create the plan of corrective action that the department requires the districts to take to positively impact student achievement. The department will take corrective action that is most likely to positively impact student achievement. The corrective action plans require districts to implement these key elements: universal screening for all students, benchmark formative assessments at least 3 times per year; additional progress monitoring assessments for students needing strategic interventions; and use of regular teacher collaboration meetings to discuss student progress data and make decisions about appropriate instruction and interventions. The department has trained District Improvement coaches and each district receives the assistance of a coach.

Districts in Improvement or Corrective Action receive the following technical assistance based on Alaska's 3-tiered model of support. (See response to 1.4.4.2)

Tier 2 - Targeted Access

Districts at Level 2 or above (Improvement) are provided with more directed technical assistance. This technical assistance is more directed and specific to the district needs. The following is assistance available from the department: Suggested formative assessment (Curriculum Based Measures - CBMs) to monitor progress and provide data to guide instruction; Site leadership training; and Consultation and online suggestions for school and district improvement planning.

Tier 3 - Intervention Access

Provide districts at Level 4 (Corrective Action) in most need of support with structured detailed technical assistance. The assistance available from the department is: Formative assessment system (CBMs); Site specific professional development - curriculum, leadership and instruction; Work with a District Improvement Coach to promote improved academic achievement; and Professional development in data based decision making, progress monitoring, formative assessments, and teacher collaboration meetings.

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	16
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments:	

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	09/13/07	08/09/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/29/07	06/29/07
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	8	3
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	9/13/07

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.

Alaska currently allocates the funds under 1003(a) using a weighted formula. Each Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring is included in the formula. The formula gives greater weight to schools in restructuring than in improvement. Additional weighting factors are used for the size of the school and for the amount of difference in the current percent of students making AYP vs. the AMO target for AYP. All of these factors taken together indicate schools with the "greatest need." The formula is used to generate the amount of funds per eligible school. The total of the School Improvement funds generated by each school is awarded to the district. The district may distribute the funds per school in the manner that best fits the needs of each school as supported by the school improvement plans and budgets submitted to the Alaska Department of Education. The schools show commitment to using these funds in the manner as described in the School Improvement plan by the end of the school year. If the funds are not used, they revert to the department for re-allocation in the next school year. Schools in improvement generally use these funds to implement research based instructional strategies, acquire materials or intervention programs, or provide professional development.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

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

	# Schools
Title I schools *from which* students transferred for public school choice	8
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	9
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	17854
Who applied to transfer	47
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	47

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 0
Comments: Districts were able to incorporate choice students in regular transportation without extra costs.	

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	21
Comments:	

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

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	34
Comments:	

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

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

FAQ about supplemental education services

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

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	13154
Who applied for supplemental educational services	1204
Who received supplemental educational services	895
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 925714
Comments:	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All schools	20609	16673	80.9	3936	19.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1804	1276	70.7	528	29.3
Low-poverty schools	2802	1908	68.1	894	31.9
All elementary schools	8659	6462	74.6	2197	25.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	1217	973	80.0	244	20.0
Low-poverty schools	4164	3589	86.2	575	13.8
All secondary schools	11950	10211	85.4	1739	14.6

Comments: All K-8 & K-12 schools are counted as elementary schools, so the # of classes taught by not HQT teachers in elementary schools includes a secondary classes taught by teachers in small rural schools who must teach multiple content areas. 92.9% of elementary classes are taught by HQT teachers in all Alaska schools as reported through EDEN file N063. It is correct that the percent of core academic classes taught by HQT in high-poverty elementary schools is higher than the percent in low-poverty elementary schools.

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state counts a full-day self-contained elementary class as one class.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 though 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are <u>not highly qualified</u>, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided <u>at each grade level</u> are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes <u>at a particular grade</u> 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 <u>for each grade</u> 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	84.5
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	14.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.3
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	81.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	18.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments: Because Alaska counts all K-8 and K-12 schools as elementary schools, the percentage of elementary school classes not taught by HQT teachers includes secondary classes. Of the 84.5% of general education classes taught by certified teachers who did not demonstrate subject-matter knowledge, 12.5% represent elementary classes and 72% represents secondary classes taught in elementary schools.	

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	81.8	32.1
Poverty metric used	Free & reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	54.0	22.0
Poverty metric used	Free & reduced lunch.	
Comments: Alaska counts all K-8 and K-12 schools as elementary schools.		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

1.6   TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	**OLOI**
5	Dual language	Russian	65.0	35.0
0	Two-way immersion	Spanish	50.0	50.0
3	Transitional bilingual	Yup' ik	50.0	50.0
0	Developmental bilingual			
3	Heritage language			
13	Sheltered English instruction			
3	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
7	Content-based ESL			
7	Pull-out ESL			
0	Other (explain)			

Comments: Heritage language programs are included in the dual language or transitional programs. The % of language instruction in English & other languages represents the maximum percent as reported by each district. The percent of instruction in the other language usually starts out with a greater percent in the earliest grades and tapers off by mid-elementary grades. These programs usually are represented at one or two schools within a district that is also using other methods of instruction such as ESL or Sheltered English.

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

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	18876
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
Yup'ik	7062
Inupiaq	1968
Spanish	1858
Filipino	1079
Russian	768

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	18585
Not tested/State annual ELP	2154
Subtotal	20739
LEP/One Data Point	3394
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the underlined 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	16852
Not tested/State annual ELP	2024
Subtotal	18876
LEP/One Data Point	2910
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	35.0	4649	24.6	N
No progress		10034		
ELP attainment	18.0	4193	22.2	Y
Comments: According to the instructions, the number with no progress is the subtotal of 18876 from 1.6.3.1.1, minus the number making progress and attaining proficiency. This includes 4934 students who either did not test or had one data point. The actual number of students who did not make the expected amount of progress was 5100.				

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

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

MFLEP	Yes
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:

1. **Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**
    - Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
    - Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.
2. **Total MFLEP =** State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.
3. **MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	1713
MFLEP/AYP grades	1462
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	5561
LEP HS/Non-AYP	2530
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:	

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 <u>native language</u> version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the <u>native language</u> version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1243	406	1649
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1416	1211	85.5	205

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: Number of MFLEP students tested (1416) represents a 96.8% participation rate of # MFLEP students in AYP grades (1462) in 1.6.3.4.3.

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
1416	1318	93.1	98

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: Number of MFLEP students tested (1416) represents a 96.8% participation rate of # MFLEP students in AYP grades (1462) in 1.6.3.4.3.

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	15
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	5
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	5
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	6
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	4
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	12
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	12
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	11
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	_No_
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 or programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	_No_
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
762	166	2

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	No	Multi-year	Yes
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	Yes	Formula	No

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	952
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. Or number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	161
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	33

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address <u>only</u> 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	15	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	15	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	14	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	11	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	11	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	15	1457
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	7	381
PD provided to principals	14	126
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	11	56
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	11	367
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	1	4
Total		2391
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

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

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/09/07	08/23/07	45
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.

We are continually working to shorten the time frame for approving the consolidated NCLB application which includes Title III. After approval, funding is available for reimbursement as of July 1 of the fiscal year. Receiving allocations by the end of May would greatly facilitate earlier approvals. The districts must submit an application based on an estimated amount of funding, and must then adjust the budgets and application according to the actual funding amount. When the funding drops, as it did this year, it can require significant program revisions.

District NCLB applications will be due May 30, 2008 for the 2008-2009 fiscal year. The state will review and respond to applications for Title III within 2 weeks of receipt. The district will be notified of any areas that need clarification or adjustment and will be asked to provide clarification within 2 weeks. The state will continue to follow-up with each district that has not yet responded at least once a week to request a response in order to have an approvable application in the shortest time frame.

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	59.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	44.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	60.3
Black, non-Hispanic	49.3
Hispanic	53.7
White, non-Hispanic	67.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	38.9
Limited English proficient	42.4
Economically disadvantaged	48.4
Migratory students	59.0
Male	56.9
Female	62.6
Comments:	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	8.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	11.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	7.2
Black, non-Hispanic	10.4
Hispanic	10.0
White, non-Hispanic	6.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8.6
Limited English proficient	8.4
Economically disadvantaged	7.4
Migratory students	6.4
Male	8.5
Female	7.3
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 **E**DUCATION FOR **H**OMELESS **C**HILDREN AND **Y**OUTHS **P**ROGRAM

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	50	49
LEAs with subgrants	4	4
Total	54	53
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 <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	<N	66
K	50	195
1	52	211
2	57	196
3	39	178
4	52	139
5	33	128
6	30	138
7	31	151
8	56	157
9	43	200
10	55	221
11	42	239
12	81	367
Ungraded	<N	0
Total	630	2586
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	296	714
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	300	1338
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	16	287
Hotels/Motels	18	247
Total	630	2586
Comments: The total above does not include homeless/youths in LEAs without subgrants reporting unknown housing situations - 20; in LEAs with subgrants - 90.		

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)	188
K	179
1	184
2	168
3	161
4	121
5	114
6	128
7	132
8	137
9	191
10	225
11	318
12	394
Ungraded	0
Total	2640
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	559
Migratory children/youth	129
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	391
Limit English proficient students	312
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	4
2. Expedited evaluations	2
3. Staff professional development and awareness	2
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
5. Transportation	4
6. Early childhood programs	1
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	4
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	3
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	3
12. Counseling	2
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
15. School supplies	3
16. Referral to other programs and services	3
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
18. Other (optional)	1
19. Other (optional)	1
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: 18. Other - obtaining legal documents; 19. Other - shower & laundry services	

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	
2. School Selection	1
3. Transportation	
4. School records	
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	
7. Other Barriers	1
Comments: Note: the immunization barrier is being removed through a change in state regulations to be effective in spring, 2008.	

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	118	80
4	83	52
5	93	63
6	93	65
7	90	48
8	91	62
High School	199	141
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	117	78
4	82	39
5	95	59
6	94	50
7	93	34
8	93	42
High School	190	89
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 **M**IGRANT **C**HILD **C**OUNTS

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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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)	670
K	569
1	611
2	704
3	664
4	662
5	684
6	711
7	757
8	744
9	874
10	758
11	639
12	782
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	483
Total	10312
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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)	60
K	74
1	111
2	138
3	121
4	117
5	101
6	97
7	101
8	79
9	85
10	83
11	57
12	<N
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	<N
Total	1238
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Child Count for Alaska decreased by approximately 15% from last year's Category 2 Child Count numbers. We believe there are two primary reasons for this decrease.

1) An increasing number of families report that they are traveling shorter distances to fish due to high gas prices, which would make some fishing moves ineligible because either school district boundaries were not crossed or the fishers did not make a move 20 miles or more in 15K districts. Increased gas prices are also preventing some people from fishing to the extent they have in the past by minimizing the number of trips that are taken. This may prevent them from qualifying under the number of nights/move requirement.

2) More districts are choosing to use their entire Title IC allocation during the regular school year rather than for additional summer programs. The majority of migrant activity is during the summer, and often the very students who are targeted for the summer programs are not able to attend. Some districts feel that concentrating services in the regular school year is a more effective use of their funds.

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.

The Alaska Migrant Education Program used MIS2000 as our migrant student information system to compile and generate our 2006-2007 child count for both Categories 1 and 2. Our child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data collected and maintained in MIS2000 includes student demographic and move information taken from the COE.

The same information is collected for regular and summer terms. The type of information collected on the COE:

1. Student Name - legal (last, first, middle; 2. Birth Data - sex, data of birth, age, multiple birth, ethnicity, place of birth; 3. Current School Information - school name, enrollment date and grade; 4. Legal Parents - mother and father's legal names (last and first; 5. Homebase - address of permanent residence and phone contact; 6. Current Parents/Guardians - completed if the qualifying worker is not the legal parent; 7. Current Residence - residence where the qualifying worker lives if different from the homebase;

8. Eligibility Data - residency date; qualifying arrival date; move (to-from) information; name of qualifying worker; boxes to check if the move was made "with" or "to join" or "on own," description of qualifying worker (parent, guardian, spouse, self); check boxes to indicate if the qualifying worker obtained or sought, seasonal or temporary work; check boxes to indicate if the qualifying worker engaged in commercial or subsistence fishing, agriculture or logging; and description of work - type of catch/crop/logging camp and type of gear/activity. Qualifying work activity information is found in our Alaska Harvest Manual: Reference Manual for Records Managers and Recruiters. This publication is updated yearly.

9. Eligibility Documentation - This section contains a check box to indicate that the move was more than 20 miles within the boundaries of a district over 15,000 square miles; a check box to indicate that additional moves were made last year that together establish a pattern of mobility that interrupted the child's education or home life and space to list the additional moves. This section also contains a check box to indicate if the child moved "to join" the qualifying worker. The date the qualifying worker moved is recorded and must be within 12 months of the child's QAD (qualifying arrival date). There is a check box to show that the qualifying worker moved "to seek" qualifying work and a space to record why the work was not obtained. The final piece of information in this section deals with temporary because 1) the activity itself has a clearly defined beginning and end, 2) the employer establishes a time frame for completion of work, or 3) the worker does not intend to perform task indefinitely. After checking the appropriate box, the necessary information (dates or explanation) is recorded in the space provided.

10. Additional Eligibility Documentation - this is the area where the principal means of livelihood information is recorded. The information recorded is for all persons living in the household during the qualifying work activity year. The information documented includes: name of employed person, relationship to child, description of work, name of employer, hours per week and months per year (approximately) that the person worked during this time period. If there is not additional employment in the family, the interviewer writes "none" in this area to show that they did ask for this information and there was no additional employment. The total number of people living in the household is recorded. There is also space for verification of the principal means of livelihood. Parents initial and date a statement certifying their reliance on the qualifying activity as a principal means of livelihood. In addition, there is a comment section where the interviewer can note important facts pertaining to the move or the family situation. Additional information comes from regular term Mass Withdrawal forms and Summer School Mass Enrollment and Withdrawal forms, and includes enroll/withdraw dates, grades, termination codes and supplemental programs information.

School districts assist the state with our recruitment efforts. They hire recruiters to conduct the interviews with the families and complete the necessary forms.

Using a pre-printed or blank COE form, recruiters interview parents and ask a series of questions based on scenarios practiced at Fall Training and sample interviews in the Alaska Harvest Manual. Migrant move and student information is written on the COE form throughout the interview. As the interview comes to an end, the recruiter reviews the completed COE form for accuracy using checklists in the training materials. If any information is unclear, the recruiter will ask additional clarifying questions at this time. The parent then reviews the COE for accuracy and signs the COE to verify that the information is correct.

In a few districts, recruitment is conducted via telephone interviews. Recruiters ask the questions of the families in the same manner as face-to-face interviews. A sample of the phone interviewing technique is found in the Alaska Harvest Manual. Recruiters document the move and student information on a COE form throughout the interview and then review the information with the parent at the end of the interview. Recruiters mainly obtain the parent signature in person, but in a few cases the signature is obtained by mail. In these instances, the completed COE form is mailed with a cover letter requesting the parents to read over the information and sign the form if everything is correct. A reply envelope is provided for return of the form. If the form is not returned by the requested date, a phone call is made to the family to follow up. A new form may need to be sent. This works extremely well for these districts and the feedback from parents has been positive. When conducting random sample COE reviews during technical

assistance visits, we have found the records done face-to-face and by phone to be of comparable quality. Recruiters work in conjunction with school secretaries or home-school liaison staff to identify new families that move into their communities to interview them for possible migrant activities.

The majority of our recruitment for eligible migrant students is done in the fall because most qualifying work activities take place during the summer. Schools start closing in May to accommodate traditional migration to fish camp. The fishing seasons are determined by nature and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and vary depending on the species being harvested. Because of the remote, isolated fish camp locations and large distances between villages (where schools are located) and traditional fish camp sites, it is not possible to have recruitment staff available at the fish camp sites. The recruitment therefore takes place immediately after the summer fishing season from mid-August to November. During that period, all new migrant moves are documented and all currently eligible migrant student families are interviewed to determine whether a new move was made.

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.

When COEs are completed and signed by the recruiter and the parent, the COE is sent to the district office where the district records manager will review the COE for errors or ambiguity and ascertain whether the family actually meets the migrant eligibility criteria. Once the records manager feels confident that the COE is error free and that the family meets migrant eligibility, he/she enters the COE into the student information system, MIS2000. Each district has one workstation with MIS2000 and one records manager trained in the database; this controls data input into the system. When COEs are entered onto the district's MIS2000 workstation and uploaded, then the COE data is electronically transferred to the State of Alaska's main server.

The full MIS2000 database is housed on the State of Alaska Department of Administration's main server. This database contains all records inputted by districts into MIS2000. When a district finishes an electronic upload, Eligibility Specialists at the Alaska Migrant Education Office will review the submitted COEs. In situations where COEs need additional or updated information, an e-mail will be sent to the district. Districts will then have the opportunity to resubmit the updated COEs through the same electronic process. When COEs are first entered, they are marked with a "Ready for Review" status. After the COE has been reviewed it will then be placed in one of three categories: Incomplete, Cancelled, or Active. Incomplete means that the COE seems to meet eligibility requirements but additional information is needed. Cancelled means that the COE does not meet eligibility requirements and the family has been made ineligible. Active means that the COE is complete and the family meets eligibility requirements. When a COE is marked as Active, all children on the COE are marked as eligible. The Eligibility Specialists routinely run reports from the MIS2000 database to determine the status of COEs.

Once COE data has been inputted and updated by district staff and has met eligibility requirements, the data is then ready to be organized into the child count report. To do this, an Identification and Recruitment Specialist runs a report in MIS2000's "Report Builder" menu that pulls an extract of all students with a school history line between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07. This extract pulls students based on their Student Sequence number, a unique number assigned by MIS2000 that cannot be manipulated by users. Pulling the data by Student Sequence number ensures that each individual record is pulled and eliminates the possibility of duplication. Once the extract has been successfully imported into Microsoft Access, various queries are performed to ensure that the data is accurate, complete, and absent of any duplication. These queries are used to pinpoint incorrect data entry along with data integrity errors. From these queries, Identification and Recruitment Specialists are then able to work with Eligibility Specialists and district staff to fix these errors. Once all reports have been run and the accuracy of the information has been examined and verified, the count is certified and submitted.

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.

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.

Queries of the database have been developed from criteria provided by the Department to the State of Alaska Migrant Education Program to produce an accurate child count.

Regular Term (category 1)

- Residency 09/01/06- 08/31/07

- Must be 3 years old

- Must be less than 22 years old

- Unduplicated - run alpha by state (student name, Student ID, birth date, parents' names, QAD, residency date, enrollment date)

- QAD within last three years

- Check for termination codes

- Verify with districts on 12th graders not graduated

Summer Term (category 2)

- Make sure regular and summer enrollments don't overlap

- Must be 3 years old

- Must be less than 22 years old

- Unduplicated - run alpha by state (name, ID, birth date, parents' names)

- QAD within last three years.

- Enrolled in MEP funded Summer School

- Be sure these students are also included in category 1 count.

The child count data is compiled by running several reports in MIS2000 and queries in Microsoft Access. We first run a report in MIS2000 which provides an alphabetical listing of eligible children, ages 3-21 who, within three years of making a qualifying move, resided in Alaska for one or more days during the period from September 1, 2006 - August 31, 2007. There are separate reports for the regular school term and summer term. Additional "find duplicate" queries are run on this eligible student list in Microsoft Access to examine such issues as duplicate student ID numbers, names, multiple births, date of birth and terminations. When duplication occurs, the student records are researched in MIS2000 by examining the COE and student data. If additional clarification is needed, MEO staff contact the district or family directly to resolve whether the data reflects two separate students or is duplicate information for the same student. All duplicates are identified and removed (or merged, if appropriate) in MIS2000, so they do not appear in the final eligible student list or eligible student count reports.

For both regular and summer terms, the MEO staff run queries to make sure the child count contains students who fit the following criteria:

1. Residency 09/01/06 - 08/31/07

2. Must be 3 years old

3. Must be less than 22 years old

4. QAD within the last three years

5. COEs status active and eligible

The MEO staff ensure that the children in the state database who turn three during the funding period are still residing in the state. As part of the state's identification and recruitment process, children are tracked by the state database from the first time they make qualifying moves with their families. Since all children with eligibility are contacted yearly and their information is verified, it is not necessary to send specific information to the recruiters.

For the summer term, the students must be enrolled in a Migrant Education Program funded summer school. These summer school students are included in the regular term count. Students who attend summer school only must be reflected in the category 1 count. The queries are run to ensure that the regular and summer enrollments do not overlap.

The eligible student list and child count information from MIS2000 is edited and filtered through several additional queries. MEO staff check for termination codes and verify with districts that 12th graders did not graduate if they are still being recruited. Queries are run to check for twins and triplets and the information is crosschecked with the student record in MIS2000. As mentioned above, several queries are run to locate and resolve duplicate information.

The following is an example of how duplications are handled. John Smith, born 8/1/85 would be noted if another John Smith, born 5/1/95 was on the list. Or, two Mary Smiths each having Robert Smith as a parent would be highlighted. Even students with the same last name and same parents that have been born within an unusually small time period (such as within 10 days of each other) are highlighted. Entries with similarities or "coincidences" are highlighted. All highlighted entries are investigated by researching the actual COE and/or previous computer entries. Based upon the information obtained, the student is either removed as a duplicate or left on because it is determined that there are two separate children.

MEO staff run additional queries to find students or COEs that are flagged as ineligible, inactive or not determined. MEO staff review each record with these pending or inactive markers in MIS2000 to verify that the status is accurate. The final eligible student list is edited so it does not include students who are flagged as pending, inactive or ineligible. MEO staff double check the final eligible student list against the final count report to verify that the number of students on each report is identical.

The unduplicated count is run by name, Student ID, birth date and parents' names. For the summer/intersession count, students are not enrolled into the system as having attended summer school unless a supplemental program is also being reported. A report is generated to verify the names of any students enrolled in summer school who did not have a supplemental programs code reported. Districts are also required to maintain documentation of services provided on-site. These are reviewed as part of the program reviews conducted by the Department of Education & Early Development. None of Alaska's districts operate intersession projects.

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.

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

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Alaska Migrant Education Program provides ongoing training and a multi-layered COE quality review process to ensure that migrant student eligibility is properly determined and verified each year. Records managers and recruiters are trained annually in the identification and recruitment process. In the fall, training sessions are held for administrators, records managers and recruiters in six regional centers throughout the state. The three-day training sessions include an in-depth review of eligibility guidelines and extensive practice sessions using ID&R tools (i.e. Alaska Harvest Manual, Recruiter Guide) to determine eligibility and properly complete COEs. All training materials are updated annually and distributed to all district staff who are responsible for migrant education identification and recruitment. Training continues during the fall recruitment season on an individual basis. District records managers work one-on-one with new recruiters. ID&R specialists work with district staff on additional training needs and plans designed specifically for individual districts. Every COE is reviewed for compliance with eligibility guidelines at least three times before it is entered in MIS2000. The recruiter first reviews the COE with the parent when conducting the family interview and obtaining signatures. The records manager conducts a quality review of the COE verifying all the information and signatures. If the records manager finds an error or needs more clarification, s/he instructs the recruiter to re-contact the family. A district representative conducts a third review of the COE and s/he verifies that the COE meets eligibility guidelines by signing the COE form. As the district records manager enters the COE data into MIS2000 s/he verifies that the electronic and paper COEs match verbatim.

In addition to these quality control procedures, MEO staff meet regularly throughout the year to assess program needs and develop new quality improvement ideas. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet weekly to discuss any districts that are having difficulty completing COEs or making proper eligibility determinations. The group collectively decides on internal actions or new procedures that can be developed to resolve the problem most efficiently. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet on a bi-weekly basis with the migrant education program manager to discuss specific COE eligibility (as noted above) and any new information pertaining to national laws and guidance. Under the program manager's guidance, the MEO team reviews the long-term training needs and quality improvement efforts that can be implemented during the following school year.

MEO staff also provide ongoing training and communication with districts to improve the quality of our program. For example, ID&R specialists send a monthly email to records managers to address common questions and issues that arise during the COE quality review process. This is beneficial to districts with a new or inexperienced staff that may have questions once they begin the recruiting after fall training. Districts can also request an audio conference with their recruiters or MEO staff to discuss problems they are having with the ID&R process. For ongoing issues with districts, eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists hold an audio conference with district staff to offer targeted training and to develop quality improvement plans to resolve the issues quickly. MEO staff frequently ask for feedback from districts about ways to improve our program.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alaska ID&R specialists visit approximately 10 districts per year as a part of our technical assistance program. During these on-site technical assistance visits, ID&R specialists conduct a thorough review of the district's identification and recruitment procedures, migrant student files and compliance with eligibility guidelines. Using a Random Student Sample Report generated from MIS2000, the ID&R specialist pulls the original COE for each student on the report from the district files and contacts each family by phone to verify the information that was recorded on the COE. Every effort is made to contact families that have been recruited by every recruiter in the district. The COE verification information provided by the parent is recorded on a review sheet and kept at the MEO with the final Technical Assistance Report. If a mistake is found on a COE or student eligibility does not seem to be valid during this review, the ID&R specialist will address these concerns with the district migrant education coordinator and records manager. The district staff will have an opportunity to respond or provide additional information about the case. The concerns will be brought back to the Migrant Program Manager at the MEO and additional research will be done, if necessary. If the family is determined not to be eligible, the ID&R specialist will create a district plan of action to clarify the problems and the steps the district must take to resolve them promptly. The plan usually requires the district to conduct additional quality review of COEs. The parameters of this quality review are set by the ID&R specialist and indicate the type and number of files to review. Re-interviews

can also be required of the district. Following the visit, the ID&R specialist and district staff keep in regular contact to verify that the plan of action is being followed and the problems resolved. The ID&R specialists follow an additional quality control procedure of conducting eligibility verification interviews via phone from the MEO. These re-interviews are conducted for a random sample of families statewide. The focus is on districts that have not received an on-site technical assistance visit in the past year.

During 2006-2007, 113 students were re-interviewed. Of those students, 111 fully met migrant qualifications. 2 of the students interviewed were misidentified and were removed from services. 363 students were randomly selected to provide a pool for review. 119 phone calls were attempted 119 calls were attempted consecutively. Of those 119 calls, 58 contacts were made and of those all 58 reviews were completed representing a response rate of 49%. 61 of the attempted contacts were not able to be completed. Of those 61 attempts, 57% were due to no response (family did not answer the telephone) and 43% were due to phone numbers no longer working or valid. A sampling replacement was not performed as the pool of randomly selected interviews was larger than needed for the interviews that were completed. The standard instrument that was used was the Interviewing Protocol Form. The Interviewing Protocol Form is completed and then compared to the COE for verification. Interviewing techniques, eligibility requirements, the role of the re-interviewer, and procedural issues are all part of the training and guidance. The re-interviewers are independent of the original interviews.

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

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

In the space below, 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 Migrant Education Office (MEO) follows several quality control procedures throughout the school year to maintain the accuracy and integrity of migrant student data in MIS2000. These procedures center on COE quality reviews, verification reports and random sample COE reviews during technical assistance visits. In order to ensure the integrity of migrant student records and COEs in MIS2000, all data collected from previous years is locked. This ensures that district personnel will not overwrite previously certified COEs and associated student information.

In the fall recruitment season, the second phase of COE review process takes place at the state. Upon receipt of the uploaded COE data in MIS2000, the eligibility specialists quality check every COE (New and No New Move). The eligibility specialists carefully review the COE data to ensure that the migrant activity, migrant move, intent of the move and principal means of livelihood are clearly in alignment with eligibility guidelines. They also review the family and student data for accuracy and correct chronological order, especially if the student attended multiple school districts in the same year. Based on this preliminary state review, the electronic COE is flagged as active, incomplete or cancelled.

Eligibility specialists then prepare a COE status report for the district records managers to indicate whether COEs are approved, need more information or are denied. The report lists the COE ID number, student names, birth date, State ID number and a space for comments. If approved, a notation of "Approved" is listed in comments. If the COE is incomplete, the eligibility specialist notes the details or questions that need to be answered in order to make an eligibility determination. If the COE is denied, this is noted on the report. These COE status reports are kept at the MEO to track the adjustments made to COEs. In MIS2000, the COE and student records remain in "incomplete" and "not determined" status while the district is obtaining the additional information. MEO staff run frequent reports of all students in "not determined status" to capture these pending cases and ensure that they are resolved prior to the child count deadline. Once the district obtains and uploads the additional information, the eligibility specialists conduct a final review and make a final eligibility determination.

If the eligibility specialists question data on a COE, they pass the COE on to the ID&R specialists for a secondary review. If more clarification is needed, the ID&R specialists will contact the records manager at the district to ask more detailed questions or instruct the recruiter to ask for more specific clarification from the family. Upon receipt of updated COE information in MIS2000 the eligibility specialists make a final eligibility determination and update the COE status in MIS2000 accordingly. In cases where the COE data is still not clear, or when the eligibility determination is difficult to make, the MEO staff conducts a third in-house quality check of the COE. Under the guidance of the migrant education program manager, the MEO staff meets to discuss the facts of the case as a group and closely consult the Non-Regulatory Guidance for direction. The group documents the date, factors discussed and outcome on the COE form and the eligibility specialists or ID &R specialists follow through accordingly.

MEO staff run internal verification reports from MIS2000 to ensure that uploaded COE data is complete and that eligibility determinations are accurate. During the fall recruitment season, eligibility specialists run weekly reports of pending student records that are flagged as "not determined" and COEs that are flagged as "ready for review" or "incomplete." There are separate reports for New and No New Move COEs. The resulting student lists are checked against COE status reports to determine the action steps necessary for making the final eligibility determination. ID&R specialists run statewide reports from MIS2000 to review and monitor COE data upload activity by districts and gauge the rate at which the work is completed. The ID&R specialists then use the report data to spot check COEs and assist districts with any COE entry issues. Eligibility specialists continue to run these "pending

status" reports throughout the year on a weekly basis. ID&R specialists run additional quarterly reports to check for potential duplicate records, discrepancies in student data (such as ID number or date of birth) or incorrect chronology when students migrate between schools or districts in a school year. Discrepancies are resolved by the ID&R specialists, who contact districts and the state assessments office to obtain the correct information in MIS2000.

If a student is reported or discovered to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R Specialist at the MEO follows an eligibility termination procedure to research, terminate and report this misidentification. At training, districts are instructed to contact the MEO if they find problems or discrepancies with any COE at any point in the year. The ID&R Specialists investigate any potential eligibility problems that are either reported by districts or are discovered during regular quality checks at the MEO. ID&R specialists document the issue, conduct an investigation, document initial findings and then meet with the Migrant Education Program Manager to discuss the case and make a final determination.

If a student is determined to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R specialist terminates the student and COE in MIS2000 under the code "I" (ineligible) to indicate the student was terminated because they were found ineligible. This changes the record from "active and eligible" to "cancelled and ineligible." The reason for the termination is added to all affected COEs in the database. Reference is made to the additional documentation made by the ID&R specialist. This additional documentation consists of a listing of affected student names, ID numbers and COE ID numbers and a detailed description of the problem, how it was researched, findings by the ID&R Specialist, the official date of termination and proof that the termination was completed in MIS2000 (print screens). The ID&R specialist then notifies the district in writing that the student(s) are terminated, the reason for this decision and the effective date of the termination. The District is informed that the MEO has terminated the student in MIS2000 and is instructed to complete the termination by documenting the termination on the original COE in the district file. Districts must write the termination code "I" (ineligible) and reason for the ineligibility finding on each affected COE form. They must also attach termination letters to all affected COEs and/ or student files.

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.

MEO staff do several final reviews to verify the accuracy of the child count produced in MIS2000 for this report. MEO staff first review the SQLs (Structured Query Language are the parameters set for the queries used to produce the counts and other reports on a computerized relational database) of the queries used for the counts in category 1 and category 2. As described above, several queries are run on the eligible student list to identify duplicate student data and students with ineligible or inactive status in MIS2000. MEO staff research and resolve these issues and then update the electronic student record accordingly. The final eligible student list reflects this editing and review process and thus only lists students who are verified as eligible and active. Several different MEO staff review the final reports and supporting documentation (queries) to ensure that the final count is accurate.

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.

If an error is found regarding student eligibility, the ID&R specialist will address these concerns with the district migrant education coordinator and records manager. The district staff will have an opportunity to respond or provide additional information about the case. The concerns will be brought back to the Migrant Program Manager at the MEO and additional research will be done, if necessary. If the family is determined to not be eligible, the ID&R specialist follows the termination procedure of terminating the student and COE in the MIS2000 database and notifying the district of the terminated eligibility in writing. In these cases, the ID&R specialist will create a district plan of action to clarify the problems and the steps the district must take to resolve them promptly. The plan usually requires the district to conduct additional quality review of COEs. The parameters of this quality review are set by the ID&R specialist and indicate the type and number of files to review. Re-interviews can also be required of the district. Following the visit, the ID&R specialist and district staff keep in regular contact to verify that the plan of action is being followed and the problems resolved.

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.

To the best of our knowledge, the eligibility determinations which are the basis for our child count are sound and accurate.

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

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