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

ARIZONA

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:
Arizona Department of Education

Address:
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Richard Valdivia

Telephone: (602) 542-3270

Fax: (602) 542-3050

e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Richard Valdivia

_____   _Friday, March 7, 2008, 6:54:26 PM_
   Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

NoChild
LeftBehind

PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State is currently revising the Mathematics Content Standard for K-12. The current plan is to present it to the State Board of Education for approval June 2008. The following year will be a transition year with full implementation in 2009-2010. The Language Arts Content Standards (Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking, Viewing and Presenting) will be revised starting the summer of 2008. The current plan is to present it the State Board for approval March 2010. The following year will be a transition year with full implementation 2011-2012. Science will be reviewed following Language Arts.

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.

The State is currently in the early development of the Modified Assessment Model for reading and mathematics in Grades 3-8 and high school. Currently the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) is holding committee meetings to determine the criteria for student participation in the assessment. Summer 2008, Arizona educators will meet to finalize the test blueprint and items specification for the modified assessment. Following those determinations, Arizona educators under the leadership of ADE will review the AIMS item bank for appropriate passages and items that can be modified to meet the item specification. After identifying usable items, a gap analysis will be completed prior to writing additional items. Field/pilot testing of the modified assessment will be in the spring of 2009. The assessment should be fully operational in spring 2010.

Although the State has approval of the Alternate Assessment which is aligned to the Alternate Academic Standards, it was determined that there was a need to enhance the assessment make it more accessible and to develop more meaningful scores. There is an expansion of the kinds of items presented to the students. Items have been field tested and will be operational spring 2008. After Standard Setting in June, student scores will be reported.

ADE will review the revised Mathematics Standard and determine if assessment items continue to align to the standard and make appropriate revisions in the assessment. After review of current items, a gap analysis will be completed and new items will be written by Arizona educators. Field testing of these items will occur spring 2010 and a revised mathematics assessment will be given spring 2011. Language Arts will follow the same model with a new assessment spring 2012.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Modified Academic Achievement Standards will be established for the Modified Assessment for Grades 3-8 and high school in reading and mathematics following the first operational administration of the assessments spring 2010.

New Alternate Academic Achievement Standards for the Alternate Assessment (AIMS A) for reading, writing, and mathematics will be established summer 2008.

Following the development and implementation of the revised assessment for mathematics, new academic achievement standards will be established spring/summer 2011.

Following the development and implementation of the revised assessment for language arts, new achievement standards will be established spring/summer 2012.

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 Science Assessment will be administered for the first time April 2008 to students in Grades 4 and 8. The assessment will be based on the Science Standard adopted in 2004. The high school assessment, administered for the first time April 2008, is based on the life science strand and the process strands and will be administered to students enrolled in a course that covers those strands within the Standard. Ninth grade students enrolled in a life science course will be allowed to participate in the assessment and their scores will be banked and reported the following year with their cohort.

The Alternate Assessment for Science will be given to students in Grade 4, 8 and high school for the first time spring 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.

Standard Setting to establish academic achievement standards for Science in Grades 4, 8, and high school will be held June 2008 after administration of the assessments in April. Standard Setting will be completed for both the regular and alternate assessments.

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	570039	555533	97.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	30795	29520	95.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	15438	15249	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	31302	30202	96.5
Hispanic	234573	228763	97.5
White, non-Hispanic	257931	251799	97.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	72161	66155	91.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	70538	68856	97.6
Economically disadvantaged students	262496	255909	97.5
Migratory students	2598	2524	97.2
Male	291625	283057	97.1
Female	278414	272476	97.9
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	28537	43.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	33053	50.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4565	6.9
Total	66155	
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	570039	557317	97.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	30795	29647	96.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	15438	15249	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	31302	30369	97.0
Hispanic	234573	229316	97.8
White, non-Hispanic	257931	252736	98.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	72161	66953	92.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	70538	68854	97.6
Economically disadvantaged students	262496	256670	97.8
Migratory students	2598	2536	97.6
Male	291625	283978	97.4
Female	278414	273339	98.2
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	33173	49.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29206	43.6
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	4574	6.8
Total	66953	
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	81535	58873	72.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4093	2243	54.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2283	1969	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4526	2792	61.7
Hispanic	35443	22270	62.8
White, non-Hispanic	35190	29599	84.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10615	4898	46.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15022	6630	44.1
Economically disadvantaged students	41596	25632	61.6
Migratory students	345	206	59.7
Male	41752	29787	71.3
Female	39783	29086	73.1
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	81234	56096	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4081	2134	52.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2281	1899	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4502	2821	62.7
Hispanic	35315	20263	57.4
White, non-Hispanic	35055	28979	82.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10314	3985	38.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14947	4910	32.8
Economically disadvantaged students	41431	23524	56.8
Migratory students	344	180	52.3
Male	41530	27043	65.1
Female	39704	29053	73.2
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	80886	59529	73.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3955	2220	56.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2228	1977	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4341	2723	62.7
Hispanic	35130	22418	63.8
White, non-Hispanic	35232	30191	85.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10738	4614	43.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12668	4962	39.2
Economically disadvantaged students	40813	25662	62.9
Migratory students	330	169	51.2
Male	41492	30321	73.1
Female	39394	29208	74.1
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	80650	52318	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3929	1841	46.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2226	1796	80.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4335	2404	55.5
Hispanic	35019	18120	51.7
White, non-Hispanic	35141	28157	80.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10495	3571	34.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12580	2601	20.7
Economically disadvantaged students	40664	20733	51.0
Migratory students	328	129	39.3
Male	41311	25008	60.5
Female	39339	27310	69.4
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	81501	56650	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4185	2119	50.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2251	1954	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4410	2540	57.6
Hispanic	34230	20262	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	36425	29775	81.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10615	3639	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10155	2887	28.4
Economically disadvantaged students	40121	23046	57.4
Migratory students	335	174	51.9
Male	41472	28343	68.3
Female	40029	28307	70.7
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	81332	56615	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	4159	2164	52.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2249	1892	84.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4412	2729	61.9
Hispanic	34143	19499	57.1
White, non-Hispanic	36369	30331	83.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10451	3513	33.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10105	2000	19.8
Economically disadvantaged students	40021	22514	56.3
Migratory students	335	159	47.5
Male	41341	27294	66.0
Female	39991	29321	73.3
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	80290	52361	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4001	1852	46.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2280	1931	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4329	2318	53.5
Hispanic	33312	17759	53.3
White, non-Hispanic	36368	28501	78.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10066	2784	27.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8915	1917	21.5
Economically disadvantaged students	38221	19845	51.9
Migratory students	322	134	41.6
Male	40957	25978	63.4
Female	39333	26383	67.1
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	80334	53813	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4009	1944	48.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2281	1890	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4352	2542	58.4
Hispanic	33302	17659	53.0
White, non-Hispanic	36390	29778	81.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10097	2978	29.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8906	1289	14.5
Economically disadvantaged students	38235	20021	52.4
Migratory students	321	116	36.1
Male	40965	26041	63.6
Female	39369	27772	70.5
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	80454	55830	69.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4491	2393	53.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2120	1855	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4352	2555	58.7
Hispanic	32966	19126	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	36525	29901	81.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9169	2657	29.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8791	2112	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	37153	21059	56.7
Migratory students	348	173	49.7
Male	40972	27409	66.9
Female	39482	28421	72.0
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	80755	54177	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4531	2274	50.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2125	1757	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4390	2607	59.4
Hispanic	33029	17724	53.7
White, non-Hispanic	36680	29815	81.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9445	2611	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8823	1265	14.3
Economically disadvantaged students	37281	19700	52.8
Migratory students	349	141	40.4
Male	41139	25522	62.0
Female	39616	28655	72.3
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	78750	48144	61.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4493	1843	41.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2076	1706	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4313	2010	46.6
Hispanic	31506	15040	47.7
White, non-Hispanic	36362	27545	75.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8481	1893	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8544	1537	18.0
Economically disadvantaged students	35114	16259	46.3
Migratory students	388	150	38.7
Male	39876	24296	60.9
Female	38874	23848	61.3
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	79080	50008	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4536	1871	41.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2077	1685	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4344	2407	55.4
Hispanic	31618	15298	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	36505	28747	78.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8785	2080	23.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8596	925	10.8
Economically disadvantaged students	35243	16681	47.3
Migratory students	391	139	35.5
Male	40074	23880	59.6
Female	39006	26128	67.0
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	72117	48562	67.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4302	1992	46.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2011	1740	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3931	2118	53.9
Hispanic	26176	14055	53.7
White, non-Hispanic	35697	28657	80.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6471	1610	24.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4761	1052	22.1
Economically disadvantaged students	22891	11790	51.5
Migratory students	456	205	45.0
Male	36536	24273	66.4
Female	35581	24289	68.3
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	73932	53580	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4402	2300	52.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2010	1700	84.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4034	2601	64.5
Hispanic	26890	15596	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	36596	31383	85.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7366	2303	31.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4897	738	15.1
Economically disadvantaged students	23795	13312	55.9
Migratory students	468	214	45.7
Male	37618	26469	70.4
Female	36314	27111	74.7
Comments: The data are accurate.			

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	1848	1336	72.3
Districts	560	327	58.4
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	1155	803	69.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	664	436	65.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	491	367	74.8
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
207	89	43.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This is a description of the measures being taken by the Arizona Department of Education to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement and a discussion of the ADE technical assistance provided.

I. SCHOOL COUNTS

The total number of schools in Warning Year is 136; in School Improvement Year One (SIY1) - 151; School Improvement Year Two (SIY1) - 46; Corrective Action - 28; Restructure Planning - 24; Restructure Implementation - 21.

II. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT RUBRIC

The Arizona Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement is the framework by which all Arizona schools can become effective schools. Schools that are identified for school improvement by either accountability measure - NCLB or AZ LEARNS - will use the Standards and Rubrics document to guide their school improvement process.

The Arizona Department of Education provides three levels of support for all schools and districts: Prevention, Assistance, and Intervention.

A. PREVENTION - The State System of School Support for all schools and districts provides (1)professional development aligned to the needs of schools that supports teachers' curriculum delivery and assessment, develops school and district leaders, and enhances the integration of technology; and (2)focused support to Title I schools that have not met AYP for the first time.

B. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ASSISTANCE - In School Improvement Years One and Two, ADE provides assistance to schools who receive consequences as a result of state or federal accountability systems. Schools in the initial stages of school improvement will receive assistance in order to develop or revise school improvement plans and to build capacity of schools and districts to implement the school improvement process so that student achievement improves. ADE will also monitor schools in the middle stages of school improvement for consistent implementation of the school improvement plan.

C. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT INTERVENTION - Schools in Corrective Action-Year 3, Restructuring Planning-Year 4 and Restructuring/Alt Governance-Year 5 has reached the intervention stage. ADE staff will become more closely involved in the school improvement process. For schools failing to meet academic standards, the ADE will direct intervention planning, followed by monitoring of the implementation of the intervention plan.

For Corrective Action (NCLB) schools, the ADE will oversee the selection and implementation of the corrective action. If a Corrective Action school moves to Restructuring Planning, the ADE will oversee the development of the structuring Plan, followed by monitoring of the implementation of the Restructuring Plan.

Collaboration - ADE staff from Academic Achievement and School Effectiveness Divisions will have specific responsibilities and will collaborate to implement the State System of School Support. Cross-division and cross-program operation will be essential to providing support to the schools impacted by consequences of both accountability measures.Schools impacted by dual consequences will, in general, be the responsibility of the system with the higher level of consequences; e.g., a school in federal Corrective Action and Underperforming Year 1 would be the responsibility of the State Intervention Section.Each school impacted by dual consequences will be evaluated individually.

III. ACTION STEPS BY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT YEAR

A. "Warning Year" under Arizona rubric - This is the 1st Year the school DOES NOT make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) OR the 2nd Year the school makes AYP in the same indicator, but DOES NOT make AYP in a different indicator. 1. Prompt notification of status to parents/legal guardians; 2.Development of Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP) within 90 days of identification; 3. District must offer technical support to school.

B. "School Improvement Year 1" - The 2nd Year the school DOES NOT make AYP in the same indicator OR the 3rd Year the school makes AYP in all indicators (School Improvement Year 1 "Frozen"). 1.Prompt notification of status to parents/legal guardians; 2. Develop/Revise and implement ASIP within 90 days of identification; 3. District must offer technical support to school; 4. District must offer public school choice (transfer) promptly; 5. School must set aside 10% Title I funds for professional

development.

C. "School Improvement Year 2" is the 3rd Year the school DOES NOT make AYP in the same indicator. 1. Complete action steps 1-5 detailed in School Improvement Year 1; 2. Offer supplemental educational services (free tutoring) to eligible students.

D. "Corrective Action (School Improvement Year 3)" is the 4th Year the school DOES NOT make AYP in the same indicator. 1. Complete action steps 1-5 detailed in School Improvement Year 1; 2.Offer supplemental services (free tutoring) to eligible students; 3. Implement at least one of the following corrective actions: ~Replace school staff relevant to failure to make AYP, ~Adopt research-based curriculum, including professional development, ~Decrease management authority at the school site, ~Appoint external expert to advise school in making AYP, ~Extend school year and/or length of school day, ~Restructure internal organization of the school site

E. "Planning for Restructuring (School Improvement Year 4)" is the 5th Year the school DOES NOT make AYP in the same indicator. 1. Complete action steps 1-5 detailed in School Improvement Year 1; 2. Offer supplemental services (free tutoring) to eligible students; 3. Prepare a plan & make necessary arrangements for alternate governance of the school site.

F. "Restructuring Plan Implementation (School Improvement Year 5)" is the 6th Year the school DOES NOT make AYP in the same indicator. 1. Complete action steps 1-5 detailed in School Improvement Year 1; 2.Offer supplemental services (free tutoring) to eligible students; 3.Implement one of the following alternative governance options: ~Reopen school as a public charter school, ~Replace all or most of the school staff, ~Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that results in significant reform.

*Action step chosen must be consistent with State law

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	11
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	5
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	12
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	6
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)	3
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	18
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.

The number of Arizona Districts served in 2006-07 for Year 1 was 12, Year 2 - 17 and in Corrective Action - 19. ADE measures for LEAs receiving Title I improvement grants are:

LEA IMPROVEMENT

YEAR 1 (12 LEAs)

August - September: 1. AYP determinations provided to Districts. LEA may appeal. 2. Superintendents of LEAs in Title I LEA Improvement receive ADE letter of improvement status. Superintendents review the components of the letter that includes: A) Fall Process attendance requirement; B) Parental Notification requirement; C) Process of Parental notification Reimbursement Grant; D) Required 10% set-aside of Title I funds for professional development. 3. LEA must make available 10% of LEA's Title I allocation for professional development to support the AYP determination. 4. Required attendance (staff) at Fall Process Workshop: A) Superintendent/designee; B) Federal Programs Coordinator; C) Curriculum Coordinator; D) Professional Development Coordinator; E) NCLB Committee Representative; F) ELL Director; G) SPED Director; H) Assessment Director. 5. After the Fall Process, the LEAs should begin their Self-Assessment Analysis.

October: The LEA must use the Parent Notification Letter template from ADE, complete and mail that letter to parents of all children in the LEA with a copy sent to ADE. The LEA may submit the LEA Parent Notification Reimbursement Grant application.

November: 1. The LEA decides whether to apply for additional Title I LEA Improvement Grant Funding. 2. Complete Self-Assessment using Standards and Rubrics for LEA Improvement.

December: LEA submits an Improvement Plan on-line by December 3. The plan addresses LEA's AYP determination and results of the Self-Assessment on Standards and Rubrics for LEA Improvement.

January - May: The District implements the LEA Improvement Plan.

>> ADE Technical Support description:

August - September: 1. ADE will publicly announce the time frame for AYP appeals. Accountability: LEA appeals are heard and receive a timely response. 2. ADE will e-mail and hard copy mail the Title I LEA Improvement status letter to Superintendents. The ADE will provide the LEAs with a Parent Notification Letter Template. Accountability: ADE will monitor the LEAs compliance with requirements noted in the Title I LEA Improvement status letter. 3. ADE reviews the LEA's NCLB Consolidated Application that must include a 10% set aside for professional development. ADE provides PD and technical assistance on application procedures. The ADE provides a PD Resource Guide. Accountability: ADE will approve LEA NCLB Consolidated Applications with a 10% set-aside for professional development that is aligned to the LEAs Improvement Plans and the AYP determinations. 4. The Fall Process Workshop shall include: A) NCLB requirements including public notification components; B) Title I LEA Improvement consequences; C) LEA Improvement Plan; D) Parental Notification Reimbursement Grant; E) Notification if additional Title I LEA Improvement Grant funding will be available through ADE; F) Review of self-assessment process by utilizing the Standards and Rubrics for LEA Improvement. The ADE will post Standards and Rubrics Self-Assessment Instructions at the ADE website. Accountability: The ADE will document attendance at Fall Process Workshop and review the results of the self-assessments that are included in the LEA Improvement Plan - due December 3, 2007.

October: The ADE will list LEAs in improvement in the State's two major newspapers and on the ADE website. The ADE will review applications for LEA Parental Notification Reimbursement Grant. Accountability: The ADE will receive a mailed copy of the Parent Notification Letter sent by Districts to parents of all children in the LEA. The ADE will review LEA Parent Notification Letters for all required components.

November: The ADE will review the LEAs Title I LEA Improvement Grant applications. The ADE will provide: A) PD; B) PD Resource Guide; C) LEA Improvement Specialist assigned to the LEA for technical assistance. Accountability: The ADE approves application for Title I LEA Improvement Grant and reviews the self-assessment plan included in the LEA Improvement Plan.

December: ADE reviews LEA Improvement Plan and provides feedback. Accountability: Cross-unit evaluation and approval of LEA Improvement Plans when the Plans address all critical factors of not making AYP.

January - May: The ADE specialist will provide technical assistance as needed. Accountability: LEA will submit a progress report that indicates the status of implementation of the LEA Improvement Plan.

YEAR 2 (17 LEAs)

August - December: Same as Year 1.

January - May: LEAs in Year 2 prepare for the LEA Resource Team Visit. LEA Resource Teams will evaluate the Self-Assessment Improvement efforts in the following areas: A) Leadership; B) Parental Involvement Activities; C) Pre-selected Corrective Action to be implemented as of Year 3. The LEA Resource Team will review the implementation of the LEA Improvement Plans, which are to address the indicators that caused the LEA to be in Title I LEA Improvement.

>> ADE Technical Support description - same as Year 1 plus prior to the LEA Resource Team visit, ADE will send protocol visit to LEAs in Year 2 of the Title I LEA Improvement in order to help them prepare for ADE's LEA Resource Team visitations. Accountability: ADE's LEA Resource Teams will visit each LEA in Year 2 of Title I LEA Improvement and provide feedback regarding the implementation of the LEAs' Improvement Plans.

YEAR 3 (19 LEAs)

August - September: Same as Years 1 and 2.

October: The LEA must use the Parent Notification Letter template from ADE, complete and mail that letter to parents of all children in the LEA with a copy sent to ADE. The LEA may submit the LEA Parent Notification Reimbursement Grant application. The LEA in Year 3 Corrective Action will receive a site visit by ADE Improvement Specialist to discuss Self-Assessment and corrective action implementation.

November: Same as Year 1 and Year 2.

December:Same as Years 1 and 2 plus LEAs in Year 3 Corrective Action will incorporate in their LEA Improvement Plan the corrective action option, as per NCLB and AZ State Law that will be implemented by the LEA.

January - May: Same as Year 1 and Year 2.

>> ADE Technical Support description:

August - September: Same as Year 1 and 2. Accountability: Same as Year 1 and 2.

October: ADE provides a site visit by their LEA Improvement Specialist in additional to the technical support listed in Year 1 and Year 2. Accountability: Same as Year 1 and 2 including an ADE specialist to monitor LEA progress in implementing the corrective action option and the recommendations made by the LEA Resource Team during the Year 2 visit.

November: Same as Year 1 and Year 2. Accountability: Same as Year 1 and Year 2.

December: Same as Year 1 and Year 2 including an ADE review of the LEA Improvement Plan, checking for Corrective Action selection by the LEA. Accountability: Same as Year 1 and Year 2, including cross-unit evaluation and approval of LEA's Improvement Plan when the plan indicates, for the LEA in Year 3 Corrective Action, which corrective action option, as per NCLB and AZ State Law.

January - May: Same as Year 1 and Year 2. Accountability: Same as Year 1 and Year 2.

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	23
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	3
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
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	09/05/07	09/05/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/01/07	08/01/07
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	85	23
Schools	255	65
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	08/30/07

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

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

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1) State Allocation Priorities - Allocations were based on the level of improvement and whether the SI task is implementation or planning. Schools located outside the 2 major metropolitan counties received an additional $8,000 to compensate for their rural status. Schools in corrective action received the highest allocation; schools in restructuring implementation were not allocated additional funds.

2) State Distribution Methods - School improvement grants are distributed by formula for each level of school improvement with an additional weight for non-metropolitan location.

3) Section 1003(a) Supported Activities - Major activities include school improvement support by trained coaches; professional development in the areas of school change, school improvement planning, instructional leadership development, needs assessment and other data collection and analysis, program selection and implementation, and improvement of instructional practices; and implementation of activities of school improvement plans, such as supplemental programs at the school or time for implementation of areas covered by professional development opportunities - reflection and analysis of instruction and student data.

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	30
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	33
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	150387
Who applied to transfer	816
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	1308

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: Arizona permits students to transfer schools without applying to leave their prior school. Since the data is not reported by students, the LEAs are closest to the source in determining why students may have transferred from the school. Therefore, we defer to their evaluation. Arizona's LEAs reported that 1308 students transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions.	

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	$ 64061
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	29
Comments: Many of the LEAs "unable" to provide school choice are single site LEAs. Only a few had all schools in a grade level in school improvement.	

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	102
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	63613
Who applied for supplemental educational services	4010
Who received supplemental educational services	3969
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	$ 3270467
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	206286	195353	94.7	10933	5.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	36863	33976	92.2	2887	7.8
Low-poverty schools	35811	34979	97.7	832	2.3
All elementary schools	158798	150382	94.7	8416	5.3
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	6659	6287	94.4	372	5.6
Low-poverty schools	8820	8481	96.2	339	3.8
All secondary schools	47488	44971	94.7	2517	5.3
Comments:					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	__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 of Arizona uses a departmentalized approach.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	67.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.1
Other (please explain)	1.2
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	60.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	17.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	18.6
Other (please explain)	3.4
Total	100.0
Comments: Other (1.20%) elementary and other (3.41%) secondary is ESL/BLE.	

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	80.2	26.6
Poverty metric used	Free or reduced lunch validated by the Arizona Department of Education Nutrition Department.	
Secondary schools	64.6	4.4
Poverty metric used	Free or reduced lunch validated by the Arizona Department of Education Nutrition Department.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

1.6 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**
34	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
	Two-way immersion			
	Transitional bilingual			
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language	Navajo	84.0	16.0
	Sheltered English instruction			
189	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
	Content-based ESL			
	Pull-out ESL			
70	Other (explain)			

Comments: Dual Language note - The State of Arizona does not distinguish between Bilingual Program Type. The "other" category is "mainstream."

Other - ELL Mainstream Program

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 underduplicated 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.	163167
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	132942
Navajo	4177
Other Non-Indian	1990
Vietnamese	1139
Arabic	751

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	167679
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	167679
LEP/One Data Point	53971
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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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	163137
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	163137
LEP/One Data Point	52035
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	13.0	80089	73.0	Y
No progress		29738		
ELP attainment	13.0	17998	10.0	N
Comments:				

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress	13.0	78721	73.0	Y
No progress		29172		
ELP attainment	13.0	17798	10.0	N
Comments: The discrepancy between the number of LEP students with ELP results in 1.6.3.2.3 and the number tested in 1.6.2.1 lies in the fact that students must have two data points to be included in the "results" calculations.				

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 underlined 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	58171
MFLEP/AYP grades	38398
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	13038
LEP HS/Non-AYP	6619
LEP other grades	117
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
23495	34676	58171
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
33168	23379	70.5	9789

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
33174	21786	65.7	11388

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

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

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	203
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	37
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	107
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	9
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	90
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	8
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	57
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	40
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	17
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	48
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	166
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	38
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
21638	0	0

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

Comments: The Arizona Department of Education is collecting more accurate data in order to distribute immigrant funds as required under Sec.3114. It is anticipated the funds will be distributed during the current fiscal year.

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	No	Formula	Yes

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	10500
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	22622
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1500

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	212	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	212	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	212	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	212	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	104	23354
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	212	23354
PD provided to principals	104	23354
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	104	23354
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community-based organization personnel		
Total		93416

Comments: The data to answer to the following topics is not available: Subject matter knowledge for teachers, PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative, PD provided to community-based organization personnel.

The State of Arizona has a many-pronged approach for targeting ELL education.

1. The first is the Structured English Immersion Endorsement (SBOE Rule # R-7-2-613) which requires all certificated personnel (teachers and administration) to have at least 60 hours of contact time in SEI training by 2009 (or 3 years from their provisional SEI certificate acquisition). This includes strategies legal background assessment and ELP proficiency standards. The state of Arizona provides reimbursement for this training with the LEA providing the numbers of teachers trained. That is why these numbers are so precise; they show how many Title III-LEA sub-grantees and educators were affected.

2. The second is that all sub-grantees receiving funds from US-ED through ADE were required to verify and attest on their 05-06 fiscal applications that LEA personnel were receiving Professional Development (PD) of a caliber required by PL107-110 (NCLB) Title III Section (Sec. 3115 subpart c).

3. Also on September 21 2007 under Chapter Four HB-2064 Arizona Revised Statutes were revised broadened in scope of authority and programs added. Specifically the Arizona ELL Task Force was formed. (ARS §§ 15-756.01)
http://www.ade.az.gov/ELLTaskForce/ The Task Force's statutory authority has resulted in the following activity:

a. All Arizona LEAs (including Title III sub-grantees) must adopt and implement an SEI model
http://www.ade.az.gov/ELLTaskForce/SEIModels9-15-07.pdf for ELD development.

b. These mandated models' structure consists of multiple elements: SEI Classroom content SEI Classroom entry/exit SEI Classroom student grouping (including grouping process and class size standards) scheduling/time allocations and teacher qualification requirements.

c. The Arizona Compensatory Instruction fund was also established with the specific intent or providing additional instructional

strategies specifically for English Proficiency for ELL students (ARS Section 15-756.11).

In addition to the SEI training, Title III subgrantees have reported the following types of professional development offered in the 2006-07 school year: Technology Training (i.e., Smart Board), Sheltered Immersion Observation Protocol (SIOP) training, Six-Trait Writing training, Brain Research, Thinking Maps, Cooperative Learning, Differentiated Instruction training, Fred Jones, Marzano, Rime and Reason, Math Academy, Kagan Grouping Structures, Curriculum Mapping, and Data Analysis.

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/06	09/01/06	62
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.

In Arizona the local education agencies (LEAs) are required to upload information regarding English language learners into the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) in order to receive Title III funding. Not all LEAs upload data in a timely manner which results in delays of the distribution of Title III funds. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) has extended time deadlines for data entry to ensure that all eligible entities receive funding. At this time ADE is considering setting a definite cut off date for the LEAs to submit data. This will require additional technical assistance to the LEAs to guarantee that there is a better understanding regarding the funding ramifications of not submitting data in a timely matter.

As it pertains to distibuting funds in accordance with Sec.3114.(d)(1) the ADE is working with LEAs to ensure that accurate information is entered into the SAIS that will allow LEAs with eligible students, who meet the necessary criteria for receiving an allocation under Sec.3114.(d)(1), to have that determination made on a more timely basis.

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	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	51.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	69.0
Hispanic	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	79.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	61.0
Limited English proficient	44.0
Economically disadvantaged	65.0
Migratory students	72.0
Male	66.0
Female	74.0
Comments: The decline in graduation rates reflects the continuing transition to using the state's student information system to calculate graduation rates.	

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	6.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6.9
Hispanic	8.6
White, non-Hispanic	4.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6.5
Limited English proficient	8.3
Economically disadvantaged	6.9
Migratory students	6.5
Male	7.4
Female	5.9
Comments: The decline in dropout rates reflects the continuing transition to using the state's student information system to calculate dropout rates.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	161	161
LEAs with subgrants	23	23
Total	184	184
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)	90	38
K	1139	893
1	1058	837
2	943	791
3	870	747
4	886	643
5	827	712
6	803	685
7	805	617
8	731	557
9	568	897
10	516	764
11	501	609
12	559	542
Ungraded	0	0
Total	10296	9332
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	2272	2209
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6651	6381
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	378	166
Hotels/Motels	649	484
Total	9950	9240
Comments: The Arizona Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) collects the primary nighttime residence in the following 5 categories: Sheltered, Doubled Up, Unsheltered, Hotel/Motel, and Unknown. Arizona had 438 "Unknown" primary nighttime residences collected through SAIS that were not included in the CSPR Report. When 438 "Unknown" primary nighttime residences are added to the previous 19,190 it brings the total to 19,628.		

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)	48
K	754
1	735
2	716
3	648
4	561
5	651
6	585
7	533
8	428
9	790
10	658
11	543
12	496
Ungraded	0
Total	8146
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	484
Migratory children/youth	44
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1115
Limit English proficient students	2023
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	17
2. Expedited evaluations	8
3. Staff professional development and awareness	18
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	18
5. Transportation	21
6. Early childhood programs	7
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	17
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	18
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	15
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	18
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	21
12. Counseling	15
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	17
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	18
15. School supplies	21
16. Referral to other programs and services	18
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	16
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	5
2. School Selection	2
3. Transportation	10
4. School records	3
5. Immunizations	3
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	3
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1320	644
4	1242	500
5	1269	611
6	1208	520
7	1110	499
8	987	373
High School	1467	586
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	1319	666
4	1241	628
5	1272	573
6	1208	486
7	1110	497
8	987	336
High School	1497	491
Comments:		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1074
K	671
1	759
2	697
3	690
4	741
5	744
6	738
7	755
8	789
9	970
10	859
11	808
12	856
Ungraded	57
Out-of-school	49
Total	11257
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reason for the 13% decrease from 2005-06 to 2006-07 is a direct result of three factors. First, the establishment of roadside checkpoints and other increased enforcement of immigration by ICE has resulted in many migrant families not moving from their current location. This reduction in mobility has resulted in migrant students losing eligibility for the migrant program. Another factor is the reduction in agricultural work in the state. Many agricultural fields are now housing and industrial developments. The third factor is Arizona's adoption of an employer sanction law that penalizes employers who knowingly hire workers who are not legal residents of the United States. Many families who are not legal residents in Arizona have now moved out of the state.

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

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58
K	116
1	138
2	150
3	155
4	156
5	122
6	139
7	122
8	103
9	108
10	92
11	83
12	28
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	1570
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.

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 system used for Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting year and the last reporting year was COEStar.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data collected relevant to the child count includes (1) the COE, (2) school or program enrollment including the school term, school year, enrollment and the withdrawal date from the program, (3) LEP assessment, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination data, (4) Instructional and Supportive Services program data including type of program and funding source.

Clerks/Liaisons at each school site conduct home visits with each migrant family who may be eligible for the Migrant Education Program. Once the interview is conducted and eligibility is determined, the migrant clerk collects all information needed to report in COEstar. COEstar is an integrated component of our data collection system and data is collected during the entire year. Information is collected on the students' classes of attendance, start date, end date, and days of attendance. The student must be present in order for that information to be entered into COEstar. The migrant clerk has access to this information for reporting purposes. The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by having the Migrant Student Information Center personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered and technical assistance for them to enter into COEstar.

Category 2 data is collected in the same manner. The main difference is that Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are enrolled in a specific summer school line in COEstar and receive a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, they receive a unique "I" code enrollment type which corresponds with Intersession.

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

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

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEstar is our primary filing system for student information, from the COE to the collection of services. COEstar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to provide the student count and additional data for the Performance Report.

Student data is collected locally by the LEAs participating in the Migrant Education Program and entered into COEstar by the Districts directly, if they have the capacity to do so, or by the staff from our data center at Statewide Services, if Districts are unable to enter data directly. At the beginning of each school year, Migrant Clerks are responsible for checking with each school's registrar to determine if enrollment is the same. Regardless of enrollment status, it is the Clerk's responsibility to attempt to contact each Migrant family in their district. This is done by either phone call or home visit. Once contact has been made, the clerk reinterviews the parents/ guardians to determine if there has been any change in eligibility. Updates to student records are made by the LEA staff upon receipt of the information, which is validated, from parents, students or school records. COEstar conducts data checks to ensure integrity of the data on the system.

Exception reports are produced by the system, which in turn generates a review by staff at our Statewide Services office. The review by staff may generate changes or updates to the information. The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by having the Migrant Student Information Center personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered and technical assistance for them to enter into COEstar.

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.

Student data is collected locally by the LEAs participating in the Migrant Education Program and entered into COEstar by the Districts directly, if they have the capacity to do so, or by the staff from our data center at Statewide Services, if Districts are unable to enter data directly. Migrant clerks collect information for the students enrolled in summer school or intersession through their districts computer data base. Information collected is the students' classes of attendance, start date, end date, and days of attendance. The student needs to be present in order for that information to be entered into COEstar. The Migrant clerk has access

to this information for reporting purposes. The State ensures that summer/intercessions are reported by having Migrant Student Information Center personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered and the technical assistance for them to enter into COEstar.

Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are enrolled in a specific summer school line in COEstar and receive a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, they receive a unique "I" code enrollment type which corresponds with Intersession.

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.

Since COEstar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source.

Since COEstar keeps a copy of the actual COE, calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulation, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted. COEstar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track, but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.

TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, Residency dates, Enrollment dates, Withdrawal dates, Departure dates, LEP, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate they left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began.

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

COEstar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state, region, county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level, eligible children are counted only once, statewide, in each eligible category.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

Migrant Recruiters and Liaisons at the LEAs receive information directly from parents or guardians regarding eligibility for MEP services. Questionable data is reviewed and parents or guardians are asked to produce information to validate eligibility data provided. For example, the Liaison or Recruiter may ask for proof of qualifying employment, proof of a qualifying move and school records. Recruiters and Liaisons may query school records directly to verify information.

Eligibility verification is done at the LEA level. Districts are required by the State Agency to make annual contact with the families and verify eligibility information. Residency is verified during these annual contact meetings. The State provides Identification and Recruitment trainings for both Migrant Recruiters and Migrant Clerks several times during the year. The State Recruitment Specialist does Migrant Program Orientation and Training for migrant staff as soon as a District hires their migrant personnel. Recruiter/ Liaisons receive complete training on the rules, regulations, and guidelines for eligibility of Migrant students. Recruiters also receive basic training on COEstar and data entry requirements. Migrant clerks receive complete COEstar data input training and hands on training on the processing of Certificates of Eligibility. Migrant clerks also receive training on Migrant program regulations to ensure they are aware of the eligibility requirements of the program. This type of training ensures Migrant Recruiters/ Liaisons and Clerks are cross trained in order that everyone is aware of the validity of the information they input and recruiters/ liaisons are oriented in data input so they are able to enter COEstar and retrieve information on former and or current Migrant students. All LEA MEP staff members are provided with the State of Arizona's Identification and Recruitment manual, copies of the OME guidance, and copies of federal regulations.

If an eligibility question does arise that a Migrant clerk is not able to resolve, the State has the following process is in place to resolve eligibility questions: First, LEA staff contact the State Identification and Recruitment specialist with questions regarding eligibility. Second, if the question is not answered, the ID&R Specialist will contact the Migrant State Department of Education (ADE) Education Program Specialist for assistance. Third, if the eligibility question is not resolved by ADE Ed. Specialist, the ADE Ed. Specialist will consult with the State Migrant Program Director for guidance. Fourth, if the eligibility question is not resolved by the State Director, the State Director will contact the Office of Migrant Education (OME) in Washington, DC for assistance.

COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Each COE can be marked as verified and locked, and invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

Our Migrant Student Information Data Center staff will conduct Data Verification. The data centers produce and send to each LEA a list of eligible students on a monthly basis and request the districts to confirm the accuracy of their district counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff. In addition, Data Centers will conduct a yearly COE review. One year it will be on-site and the next year will be a paper review. Through this process they are also checking for eligibility, QAD, qualifying activity, dates and locations.

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.

There was no reinterview process during this reporting period.

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.

COEstar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data. Since all COEstar data originates with the collection of the COE, COEstar is included in the overall Quality control process. Additional data, like enrollment and services data, is thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

COEstar does not merge data. All data kept by COEstar databases is relational based on internal keys and all information for a student is related. The system does support data synchronization between multiple stand-alone systems using a very accurate and proprietary technology developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation. This method relies on record stamping using keys and data signatures to determine how data is exchanged and consolidated. The process is similar to other database synchronization methods but is much more refined and precise. COEstar documentation provides more information about data partners and the synchronization process.

Staff at State Wide Services reviews COE data inputted at local terminals to ensure accuracy of the COE. Staff also verifies data inputted by the LEA regarding services provided to ensure the LEA has accurately categorized the type of service. Data verifications are done by sampling LEA COE's. The amount sampled is directly correlated to the number of students in each program. This year, the Arizona Department of Education implemented a process for further verification of the COEstar data. This process is designed to validate the information in COEstar by District, school, and student name to identify any errors that COEstar may not have picked up.

Throughout the year, Statewide Services staff and staff from the Arizona Department of Education conduct staff development sessions where Recruiters, Liaisons and clerks are trained in the requirements of the Migrant Program including eligibility data input and validation. The two data centers in Somerton, Arizona and Littleton, Arizona synchronize three times a week to ensure accuracy of the student data. Staff review error reports produced by COEstar, validate the data and generate necessary data inputs to correct these errors. The Data Centers produce and send to each LEA a list of eligible students on a monthly basis and request the districts to confirm the accuracy of their District counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff.

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

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and dependable, all numbers are double and triple checked against other sources to insure accuracy. In addition, reports are run throughout the year to monitor child counts as part of the quality control process.

We have a specific data verification procedure in place at the SEA. Student information is sent in the form of a table with information including name, ID number, district, and school information. Identical matches and near matches are identified. Near matches are investigated by hand and a determination made as to whether they are the same child. Any duplicates that are found are sent back to the data center for corrections to be made prior to the submission of the child count report.

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.

COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and dependable. All numbers are double and triple checked against other sources to insure accuracy. In addition, reports are run throughout the year to monitor student counts as part of the quality control process. We have a specific data verification procedure in place at the State MEP Office. The State MEP Office requests student information from the Data Centers in the form of a table with information including student name, ID number, district, and school information. Identical matches and near matches are identified. Near matches are investigated by hand and a determination made as to whether they are the same child. Any near matches that are found to be duplicates are sent back to the data center for corrections to be made prior to the submission of the child count report. This process continues until all students have been individually looked at and no further changes are requested. When corrections are done and a new count is generated, this information is compared to the prior year's numbers. This corrected count is submitted to the Migrant Director for final review.

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.

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

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