

**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**

**LOUISIANA**



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

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

**PART I**

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

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

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

**PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Louisiana Department of Education		
Address: 1201 N. Third Street Baton Rouge, LA 70802		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Susan W. Batson		
Telephone: 225-342-3513		
Fax: 225-219-7370		
e-mail: Susan.Batson@la.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Scott M. Norton, Ph.D.		
		<u>Saturday, March 8, 2008, 12:11:57 AM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2006-07**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since 1993, the Louisiana Department of Education has engaged in significant reform efforts. Louisiana's education reform initiatives are built on the concept of rigorous and challenging content standards. In the early 1990s, Louisiana began a process of raising these academic standards. The Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) to begin development of content standards in Mathematics and Science. Additionally, in 1996, the LDE convened committees of Louisiana educators to develop content standards in the other core subject areas in addition to mathematics and science; standards were also developed in English language arts, social studies, the arts, and foreign languages. After several rounds of development by committees representing teachers, school administrators, business and industry, and parents, drafts of these documents were presented to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) during the fall of 1996.

In addition to development and review by the content standards committees, a team of external evaluators reviewed the standards. The State Education Improvement Partnership (SEIP) coordinated this effort. Also, numerous public forums, focus groups, and public meetings were held to gather public input before the content standards and benchmarks were finalized. Approximately 25,000 surveys were distributed to educators statewide during the public review process.

In 1997, the Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) approved the content standards for English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, foreign languages, and the arts. These content standards have been used as the basis for local curriculum and the state's standards-based assessment program. The standards are clustered into benchmarks for grades K-4, 5-8, and 9-12.

Since the adoption of content standards in 1997, the LDE has also developed Grade-Level Expectations. The development of Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs) in 2003 in English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies was a continuation of Louisiana's effort to expand and extend the content standards. GLEs identify what all students should know or be able to do by the end of a given grade level from prekindergarten through grade 12 in these four content areas. In 2004, the SBESE approved the GLEs as an integral component of the Louisiana content standards.

Each grade-level expectation is meant to further define a content standard and benchmark(s). There is a progression of specificity; the standards represent broad statements, benchmarks are more specific, and GLEs provide the most detail. Grade-level expectations have been developed from prekindergarten through grade 12.

GLEs do not represent the entire curriculum for a given grade or course. Rather, they represent the core content that should be mastered by the end of a given year by all students. For mastery to be achieved at a given level, it may be necessary for those skills to be introduced at an earlier grade. Similarly, skills will need to be maintained after mastery has occurred.

During the 2006/2007 year, no revisions or changes to content standards or GLEs has been implemented. However, the state content standards and grade-level expectations are scheduled to be revised during 2008-2009. Subsequently, the state assessment frameworks will be revised to reflect the revised standards; the assessments will be phased in by content areas beginning in 2011-2012.

#### LEAP Alternate Assessment 1 (LAA 1) Extended Standards

Based on the recommendation of the USDOE, the LDE re-evaluated the LAA 1 assessment program and created a plan to write extended standards in English language arts, mathematics, and science during the summer of 2007. The development of the extended standards and assessment tasks will take place during the 2007-2008 school year.

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



### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to meet the NCLB assessment requirements, the State will use a comprehensive assessment system, including criterion-referenced tests (CRT), augmented norm-referenced tests (NRT), and alternate assessments (AA). The State fully implemented these assessments in the spring of 2006, in accordance with NCLB timelines. Although the State's comprehensive assessment system goes beyond the NCLB required subjects and grades, the NCLB-required tests are detailed below.

#### Assessments in Reading and Math, Grades 3-8, high school

The State will use the existing CRTs to meet the assessment requirements at grades 4, 8, and high school (grade 10). The 4th and 8th grade tests, known as LEAP (for Louisiana Educational Assessment Program) are given in the spring of each year. The English and Math LEAP tests at grades 4 and 8 began in Spring 1999, and the English and math tests at grade 10 began in Spring 2001. These tests have been used in the state's accountability system since they were implemented.

To meet the NCLB assessment requirement for the remaining grades, the State has developed augmented NRTs in English (Reading) and Math at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 (and also grade 9, although not required). These new tests, known as iLEAP (for integrated LEAP), include an NRT component (The Iowa Tests) with the addition of a CRT component that measure the state standards not measured on the Iowa Tests. iLEAP is referred to as an integrated LEAP because it combines NRT and CRT items. iLEAP replaced the previous NRT at grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

The iLEAP English language arts and mathematics tests include a short form (survey form) of The Iowa Tests augmented with standards-based items. Through a multiyear contract, the Louisiana Department of Education has developed and field tested augmented NRTs for English language arts and mathematics. These tests were implemented in spring of 2006. The major procedures in the development process are outlined in the 2005-2006 Consolidated Report.

Louisiana educators from across the state were involved throughout the item development phase and in setting the performances standards for iLEAP. These educators served on several committees: achievement level descriptors committees, item review committees, bias review committees, and standard-setting committees.

During the 2006/2007 year, no revisions or changes to the general assessments in reading and mathematics grades 3-8 and high school were implemented. However, the state content standards and grade-level expectations are scheduled to be revised during 2008-2009. Subsequently, the state assessment frameworks will be revised to reflect the revised standards; the assessments will be phased in by content areas beginning in 2011-2012.

#### Alternate Assessments

##### LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1)

A small percentage of students require different instructional foci in order to benefit from the general education curriculum. Such students participate in the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1), which focuses on the most basic components and critical functions of the content standards and foundation skills. The decision whether a student participates in alternate assessment requires an IEP Team decision and is based upon the LEAP Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria. Development of this alternate assessment, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), has been completed and has been implemented for several years. The test is based, to the extent possible, on the grade-level content standards; however, students are not working toward grade-level achievement standards. Alternate achievement standards are used instead. LAA 1 students are included in all school and district accountability calculations.

Currently, the LAA 1 testing program is under revision. During the 2006-2007 school year, the LDE designed a plan to develop academic extended standards and assessment tasks across four grade spans. The new LAA 1 will be implemented in the 2007-2008 school year.

## LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2)

The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) further directed the Department to develop an additional alternate assessment. The Louisiana Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2) is designed for students with persistent academic disabilities who are not eligible for the LAA 1, but who are not cognitively able to successfully participate in the general statewide assessments (LEAP and GEE). Based on input received from the Louisiana Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the assessment should be based on the grade-level content standards and should be scored against modified achievement standards. The state board approved this plan. The LAA 2 is developed and implemented for the same grades and subjects that exist for the regular statewide assessments. The tests would include:

Grades 3-8: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies

Grades 9 and 10: English Language Arts and Mathematics

Grades 4, 8 and 11: Science and Social Studies

Spring of 2006 marked the first implementation of the LAA 2 assessments for grades 4, 8, and 10 in English language arts and mathematics, and the grade 11 assessments in science and social studies. Like the process used in development of other state assessments, teachers were involved in the review and selection of items to be included on the LAA 2 assessments. As described in more detail in the 2005 Consolidated Report, the same process was used for developing these assessments as used for developing other Louisiana assessments. Content and grade-level committees of teachers representing regular education and special education convened to review some selected items from Louisiana's existing item banks to determine their appropriateness for this population of students. Testing contractor West Ed facilitated the meetings and developed the test forms for grades 4, 8, 10, and 11 for final review and approval. LAA 2 assessments in English language arts and mathematics for grades 5, 6, 7, and 9 are currently under development for administration in spring of 2007. The remaining grade-level forms for science and social studies will be developed in 2006-2007 for implementation in 2008.

### LAA 2 Standard Setting

In June of 2006, the LDE convened a statewide committee of educators for the purpose of setting performance standards for LAA 2. Using the data from the spring administration of LAA 2, testing contractor Data Recognition Corporation facilitated the process using a modified bookmark procedure. Students, schools, and districts received LAA 2 results in September, 2006. These the results are reported in terms of four achievement levels:

Basic, Approaching Basic, Foundational, and Pre-foundational. The top two levels are equivalent to the performance levels of LEAP and GEE, i.e., a LAA 2 student performing at these two levels would have similar performance to a student performing at these levels on the state general assessment. The lower two levels of Foundational and Pre-Foundational were established to better differentiate those groups of students that would fall into the Unsatisfactory achievement level on LEAP and GEE.

Participation in the LAA 2 is based on eligibility criteria that have been developed. We assume that the criteria would ultimately result in about 1-2% of the student population participating in the program (approximately a total of 6,000 students). Students meeting the eligibility criteria take the tests for the grade in which they are enrolled.

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

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

### 1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Academic achievement standards have been completed for all required grades and subjects of the regular statewide assessments. These descriptions, known as Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) in Louisiana, were completed in two phases.

#### LEAP and GEE

The academic achievement standards for English (Reading) and Math for LEAP (grades 4 and 8) and for English (Reading) and Math at high school (grade 10) were developed as part of the state's standard-setting process when those tests were developed and implemented several years ago. These documents have been circulated and are posted on the state's web site for public use. The academic achievement standards for science at three grade levels (4, 8, and 11) were also completed on the same timetable.

No revision or changes to the LEAP/GEE achievement level standards has been implemented.

#### iLEAP

The academic achievement standards for English (Reading) and Math for iLEAP at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 were completed in 2004. These documents were completed through a collaborative effort of the Department staff, the assessment vendor, and committees of teachers who reviewed and revised the draft documents.

No revision or changes to the iLEAP achievement level standards has been implemented.

#### LAA1

In the fall of 2005, committees of special education teachers convened to review draft documents of academic achievement standards for the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1). Committees representing each content (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) reviewed academic achievement standards that defined performance at different levels for the skills on which LAA 1 students are assessed. Committee members categorized the standards for each skill according to difficulty (easy to difficult). The results of this activity were used to set the alternate achievement standards.

The LAA 1 standards will be revised during the 2007/2008 year.

#### LAA 2

Modified academic achievement standards for the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2) are content and grade-level specific criteria that describe what Louisiana students taking the LAA 2 should know and be able to do at each achievement level. The academic achievement standards for Approaching Basic and Basic are adaptations of those for LEAP/GEE, while the standards for Foundational and Pre-Foundational were developed in spring 2006 by Louisiana educators. The modified academic achievement standards were used extensively to guide the panelists who set the cut scores.

No revision or changes to the LAA 2 achievement level standards has been implemented.

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.

#### Criterion-Referenced Tests in Science (grades 4, 8, and 11)

The State will use the existing criterion-referenced tests to meet the assessment requirements at grades 4, 8, and high school (grade 11). The 4th and 8th grade tests, known as LEAP (for Louisiana Educational Assessment Program) are given in the spring of each year. The Science LEAP tests at grades 4 and 8 began in Spring 2000, and the Science test at grade 11 began in Spring 2002. These tests have been used in the state's accountability system since they were implemented.

The state content standards and grade-level expectations are scheduled to be revised during 2008-2009. Subsequently, the state assessment frameworks will be revised to reflect the revised standards; the assessments will be phased in by content areas beginning in 2011-2012.

#### LAA 1

A small percentage of students require different instructional foci in order to benefit from the general education curriculum. Such students participate in the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1), which focuses on the most basic components and critical functions of the content standards and foundation skills. The decision whether a student participates in alternate assessment requires an IEP Team decision and is based upon the LEAP Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria. Development of this alternate assessment, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), has been completed and has been implemented for several years. The test is based, to the extent possible, on the grade-level content standards; however, students are not working toward grade-level achievement standards. Alternate achievement standards are used instead. LAA 1 students are included in all school and district accountability calculations.

Currently, the LAA 1 testing program is under revision. During the 2006-2007 school year, the LDE designed a plan to develop academic extended standards and assessment tasks for grades 4, 8 and 11 science. The new LAA 1 science assessment for grades 4, 8 and 11 will be implemented in the 2007-2008 school year.

#### LAA 2

Spring of 2006 marked the first implementation of the LAA 2 assessments for the grade 11 assessment in science. Like the process used in development of other state assessments, teachers were involved in the review and selection of items to be included on the LAA 2 assessments. As described in more detail in the 2005 Consolidated Report, the same process was used for developing these assessments as used for developing other Louisiana assessments. Content and grade-level committees of teachers representing regular education and special education convened to review some selected items from Louisiana's existing item banks to determine their appropriateness for this population of students. Testing contractor West Ed facilitated the meetings and developed the test forms for grade 11 for final review and approval. The remaining grade-level forms for science will be developed in 2006-2007 for implementation in 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.

Academic achievement standards have been completed for all required grades and subjects of the regular statewide assessments. These descriptions are called Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) in Louisiana and have been developed for all testing programs.

#### LEAP and GEE

The academic achievement standards for science for LEAP (grades 4 and 8) and for science at high school (grade 11) were developed as part of the state's standard-setting process when those tests were developed and implemented several years ago. These documents have been circulated and are posted on the state's web site for public use.

#### LAA1

In the fall of 2005, committees of special education teachers convened to review draft documents of academic achievement standards for the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1). Committees representing science reviewed academic achievement standards that defined performance at different levels for the skills on which LAA 1 students are assessed. Committee members categorized the standards for each skill according to difficulty (easy to difficult). The results of this activity were used to set the alternate achievement standards.

The LAA-1 testing program is currently under revision. New science extended standards are being developed for grades 4, 8 and 11, and new test items will be administered in the spring of 2008. During the summer of 2008, the State will implement a standard-setting process and convene a committee of Louisiana educators to set standards using revised ALDs for LAA 1.

#### LAA 2

Modified academic achievement standards for the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2) are content and grade-level specific criteria that describe what Louisiana students taking the LAA 2 should know and be able to do at each achievement level. The academic achievement standards for Approaching Basic and Basic are adaptations of those for LEAP/GEE, while the standards for Foundational and Pre-Foundational were developed in spring 2006 by Louisiana educators. The modified academic achievement standards were used extensively to guide the panelists who set the cut scores. The grade 11 science achievement level standards for LAA 1 were set by a committee of educators during the summer of 2006. The grade 4 and 8 achievement level standards will be set by a committee of Louisiana educators during the summer of 2008.

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

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

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

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

**1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

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

<b>Student Group</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All students	331713	330893	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2684	2682	99.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4688	4679	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	148382	147817	99.6
Hispanic	7911	7901	99.9
White, non-Hispanic	167970	167859	99.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	41021	40890	99.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5062	5045	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	209129	208635	99.8
Migratory students	1328	1327	99.9
Male	167597	167194	99.8
Female	163994	163699	99.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	6879	15.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30059	68.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	3297	7.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3649	8.3
Total	43884	
<b>Comments:</b> The total number of students with disabilities counted in this table does not flag for a full academic year as defined under IDEA.		

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	331627	330888	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2683	2681	99.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4693	4684	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	148315	147808	99.7
Hispanic	7900	7893	99.9
White, non-Hispanic	167953	167858	99.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	41014	40895	99.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5053	5040	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	209069	208644	99.8
Migratory students	1326	1326	100.0
Male	167556	167205	99.8
Female	163952	163683	99.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	6876	15.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30080	68.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	3301	7.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3649	8.3
Total	43906	
<b>Comments:</b> The total number of students with disabilities counted in this table does not flag for a full academic year as defined under IDEA.		

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

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

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

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

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

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

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

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

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	48784	31820	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	415	285	68.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	609	513	84.2
Black, non-Hispanic	22038	10829	49.1
Hispanic	1268	829	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	24439	19360	79.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6692	2863	42.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	851	557	65.5
Economically disadvantaged students	33037	18827	57.0
Migratory students	211	116	55.0
Male	24976	16258	65.1
Female	23789	15555	65.4
<b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.			
The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.			
In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.			

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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	48789	31674	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	415	283	68.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	609	485	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22047	11361	51.5
Hispanic	1268	759	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	24434	18783	76.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6691	2592	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	851	557	65.5
Economically disadvantaged students	33040	18880	57.1
Migratory students	211	111	52.6
Male	24979	14829	59.4
Female	23790	16840	70.8
<b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.			
In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.			
The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.			

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

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

**1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	47734	30667	64.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	376	247	65.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	667	570	85.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21388	10197	47.7
Hispanic	1182	779	65.9
White, non-Hispanic	24116	18872	78.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6584	2387	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	796	530	66.6
Economically disadvantaged students	31858	17614	55.3
Migratory students	226	132	58.4
Male	24281	15565	64.1
Female	23445	15101	64.4
<b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.			
In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.			
The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.			

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**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	47726	33191	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	376	268	71.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	667	547	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21380	12443	58.2
Hispanic	1182	822	69.5
White, non-Hispanic	24116	19109	79.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6583	2342	35.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	796	530	66.6
Economically disadvantaged students	31848	19782	62.1
Migratory students	227	137	60.4
Male	24284	15684	64.6
Female	23434	17505	74.7
<b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.			
In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.			
The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.			

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

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

**1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49066	28567	58.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	433	266	61.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	702	564	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22083	8892	40.3
Hispanic	1224	700	57.2
White, non-Hispanic	24611	18140	73.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6956	2175	31.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	791	435	55.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32712	15927	48.7
Migratory students	214	109	50.9
Male	25235	14830	58.8
Female	23815	13733	57.7
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49068	28862	58.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	433	261	60.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	702	537	76.5
Black, non-Hispanic	22084	9801	44.4
Hispanic	1224	670	54.7
White, non-Hispanic	24612	17588	71.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6958	1819	26.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	791	435	55.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32718	16287	49.8
Migratory students	214	93	43.5
Male	25234	13470	53.4
Female	23818	15388	64.6
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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

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



**1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	48721	30310	62.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	386	243	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	657	538	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22277	10287	46.2
Hispanic	1109	684	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	24281	18556	76.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6277	1871	29.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	647	362	56.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31613	16819	53.2
Migratory students	193	120	62.2
Male	24999	15279	61.1
Female	23697	15024	63.4
<b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.			
In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.			
The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.			

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**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	48733	30187	61.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	386	258	66.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	657	518	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22288	10470	47.0
Hispanic	1110	638	57.5
White, non-Hispanic	24280	18302	75.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6281	1762	28.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	647	362	56.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31626	16654	52.7
Migratory students	193	110	57.0
Male	25013	13971	55.9
Female	23694	16210	68.4
<b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.			
In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.			
The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.			

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

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

**1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	46520	27427	59.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	229	62.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	628	526	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20862	8744	41.9
Hispanic	1138	657	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	23511	17263	73.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5539	1468	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	546	294	53.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29035	14247	49.1
Migratory students	205	109	53.2
Male	23524	13795	58.6
Female	22977	13625	59.3
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	46527	28042	60.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	234	63.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	628	502	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20874	9411	45.1
Hispanic	1138	628	55.2
White, non-Hispanic	23505	17259	73.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5541	1283	23.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	546	294	53.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29043	14666	50.5
Migratory students	204	111	54.4
Male	23527	12724	54.1
Female	22981	15311	66.6
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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

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

**1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47593	26584	55.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	375	197	52.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	652	535	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	21388	8051	37.6
Hispanic	1057	570	53.9
White, non-Hispanic	24113	17229	71.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5232	1155	22.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	491	252	51.3
Economically disadvantaged students	29168	13345	45.8
Migratory students	162	78	48.2
Male	23838	13429	56.3
Female	23747	13152	55.4
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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	47591	27984	58.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	374	221	59.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	653	460	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21394	9353	43.7
Hispanic	1052	594	56.5
White, non-Hispanic	24110	17355	72.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5226	1036	19.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	491	252	51.3
Economically disadvantaged students	29179	14329	49.1
Migratory students	163	78	47.9
Male	23836	12301	51.6
Female	23747	15682	66.0
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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

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

**1.3.13 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	42472	26781	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	330	208	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	741	600	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17776	8169	46.0
Hispanic	842	477	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	22779	17326	76.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3610	1087	30.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	377	193	51.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21135	11274	53.3
Migratory students	112	62	55.4
Male	20279	13240	65.3
Female	22173	13538	61.1
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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	42449	24005	56.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	330	193	58.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	745	527	70.7
Black, non-Hispanic	17736	7215	40.7
Hispanic	836	425	50.8
White, non-Hispanic	22793	15642	68.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3613	946	26.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	377	193	51.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21112	9783	46.3
Migratory students	110	49	44.6
Male	20272	10557	52.1
Female	22160	13445	60.7
<p><b>Comments:</b> Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups in the 2005-06 school year. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.</p> <p>In the 2006-07 school year all students were counted in the listed subgroups.</p> <p>The LEP subgroup counts reflect achievement by grade-level. The corrected EDEN Files N075 and N078 were submitted on 12/28/07 at 11am CST.</p>			

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

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



#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1231	1086	88.2
Districts			

**Comments:** Any district appeal of AYP would be based on school level data. Only one (1) district could potentially enter district improvement based on 2006-07 results and they have not sent any appeals for their school data. District AYP dterminations will not be finalized until March 2008.

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	896	786	87.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	836	733	87.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	60	53	88.3

**Comments:** In 2005-06 a significant number of Title I schools were severely impacted by hurricanes. Some of those schools and new schools have opened and populated with significant numbers of low-income students.

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

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

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
68		

**Comments:** Any district appeal of AYP would be based on school level data. Only one (1) district could potentially enter district improvement based on 2006-07 results and they have not sent any appeals for their school data. District AYP dterminations will not be finalized until March 2008.

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))<sup>1</sup>
- 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**A. Schools entering SI 1 must;**

1. submit for approval a new or revised School Improvement Plan (SIP) to the LDE within 60 days of identification.
  - a. The plan must meet all guidelines established by the LDE prior to the release of preliminary accountability results and disseminated to LEAs within 10 days of notification of SI status.
  - b. The plan must be based on a needs assessment that includes classroom observations and that was conducted within the past 24 months.
  - c. The plan shall include sufficient detail to drive school reform efforts for the remainder of the academic year in which the school was labeled SI.
2. participate in a Scholastic Audit provided by the LDE.
3. participate in the creation of a new SIP based on the results of the Scholastic Audit.
4. The new SIP must;
  - a. be written with the assistance of the LDE (Distinguished Educator Regional Educational Service Coordinator contractor or other LDE staff)
  - b. encompass a two-year span
  - c. include details that assume the school will advance to SI 2 and CA 1 over the next two years (include SES and item/s from the Corrective Action list (see requirements for CA 1))
  - d. follow all guidelines established by the LDE
  - e. include the priorities listed in the Scholastic Audit report
  - f. be submitted for approval to the LDE
6. Parents of students in SI shall have the right to transfer their child to a higher performing public school.

**C. Schools entering SI 2 must;**

1. implement a SIP meeting the standards in A (above)
2. offer Supplemental Educational Services if they are Title 1 schools
3. implement a remedy from the following corrective action list if they are not Title 1 schools;
4. submit Quarterly Implementation Reports as defined by the LDE;
5. if desired enter a cooperative agreement with the LDE to work with a Turnaround Specialist.

**D. Schools entering CA2 must;**

1. add a remedy from the corrective action list (all schools);
2. develop a reconstitution plan (see D below);

3. enter a cooperative agreement with the LDE to work with a Distinguished Educator.

E. In compliance with RS 17:10.5 schools labeled SI for 4 consecutive years are eligible for state takeover (other criteria may apply).

1. The means for this takeover occurring is a group submitting a proposal for a type 5 charter school and by BESE awarding a charter to the group.

2. Since multiple proposals may be submitted for 1 school they are evaluated and the proposal most likely to succeed is most likely to receive the charter.

3. The reconstitution plan in C2 (above) serves as an LEA's proposal to keep and reconstitute its school.

4. If the LEA's proposal is determined to have the best chance to succeed BESE can allow the district the opportunity to reconstitute the school.

F. Schools entering CA2 must submit the reconstitution plan developed in CA 1 to the LDE for approval and for the LEA to retain control of the school (as opposed to placement in the Recovery School District (RSD)).

G. Schools entering Restructuring 1 and 2 must implement the approved reconstitution plan

1. Failure to submit a reconstitution plan or failure to implement an approved reconstitution plan is grounds for placing a school in the RSD.

H. Schools that remain SI for 7 or more years are eligible for the RSD.

State's Responsibilities to Districts with Schools in School Improvement and schools labeled Subgroup Component failure as aligned with Chapter 16 levels of remedies and sanctions.

1. provide diagnostic process for schools;

2. provide training for district assistance in needs assessments and data analysis;

3. work to secure new funding and/or redirect existing resources to help schools implement their improvement plans;

4. provide additional school improvement funds as available.

5. provide training for District Assistance Teams;

6. work to secure new funding and/or redirect existing resources to help implement their improvement plans;

7. approve school choice plans;

8. ensure that a external Scholastic Audits are completed for schools as funding is available. If funding is limited schools will be prioritized from lowest SPS to highest SPS and Scholastic Audits will be conducted in rank order until funding is exhausted.

9. may provide a distinguished educator to academically unacceptable schools to assist in the development and design of the reconstitution plan as available; and

10. SBESE shall approve or disapprove reconstitution plans. If the SBESE approves the reconstitution plan a partnership may be offered to the district for the assistance of a DE to support and assist with monitoring the implementation of the reconstitution plan for schools that fail to make adequate growth;

11. SBESE shall approve or disapprove alternate governance plans; SBESE shall approve or disapprove "Focused Reconstitution " plans;

12. monitor the implementation of all schools' reconstitution/alternate governance plans.

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	23
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	13
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	16
Replacement of the principal	15
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	16
<b>Comments:</b>	

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)	4
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	4
<b>Comments:</b> The four schools in which restructuring actions are being implemented are Prescott Middle School, Capitol Pre-College Academy for Girls, and Capitol Pre-College Academy for Boys in East Baton Rouge Parish (EBRP), and Bethune Middle School in Caddo Parish. The other major restructuring actions at Prescott Middle School include: (1) The Superintendent and the EBRP School Board have employed a Community Relations Facilitator to facilitate the development and implementation of the Reconstitution Plan. (2) The Superintendent and the EBRP School Board are coordinating their improvement efforts with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The other major restructuring actions at Capitol Pre-College Academies for Girls and Boys include: (1) EBRP Superintendent has the responsibility of monitoring the implementation plan and making periodic implementation reports to the EBRP School Board and to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE). (2) The Superintendent appointed a Reconstitution Team that meets monthly to monitor progress. (3) A "Turnaround" Team was appointed to oversee the implementation of the Reconstitution Plan. A "Turnaround" Principal, specifically selected and trained, works in partnership with the following partners, Thurgood Marshall Foundation; Southern University; the Capitol Alumni Association; and MASTER, Inc. Other major restructuring actions in Bethune Middle School include: (1) The Specialized District Assistance Team, a form of alternate governance, was appointed by the Superintendent. (2) The Superintendent appointed a Hiring Board that will interview all applicants and make recommendations for placements.	

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<sup>2</sup>)
- 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.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts failing AYP 1 year must do a self-analysis and submit it to the LDE. The LDE reviews each plan and may recommend that the district presents its findings to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE). A second year of failure requires the district to write a district improvement plan based on the results of the self-study. The plan is submitted to the LDE and reviewed for approval. The LDE recommend that the SBESE call the district personnel in for a "district dialogue" - a discussion of how the district intends to implement the improvement plan and address the academic deficiencies. A third year of failure triggers a fiscal and academic audit and a review of all support services. A fourth year of failure requires SBESE to take action on the prior year's audit. Each time SBESE is involved for 1-4 years of failure it discusses and recommends solutions to the specific problems of the district.

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.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	1
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> Any district appeal of AYP would be based on school level data. Only one (1) district could potentially enter district improvement based on 2006-07 results and they have not sent any appeals for their school data. District AYP determinations will not be finalized until March 2008.	

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	03/15/08	01/15/08
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	03/15/08	08/01/07
<b>Comments:</b> Louisiana required schools/districts to implement sanctions on August 1 2007. On September 6 2007 we released all scores including those schools that failed the first year of AYP. Appeals were filed within 30 days of the release. Our state board approved the appeals at their October 18 2007 meeting. We are currently recalculating scores to determine what schools earned rewards. We have never had a school appeal its way out of sanctions and will not this year. Any district appeal of AYP would be based on school level data. Only one (1) district could potentially enter district improvement based on 2006-07 results and they have not sent any appeals for their school data.		

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

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

#### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	1/15/08
---	---------

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.

The State uses the 1003(g) funds to assist schools in implementing effective School Improvement strategies designed to improve academic achievement standards for all students. Funds are allocated to schools and districts based on a funding formula and specific criteria. Each district receives a base amount and a per child amount to be utilized for School improvement activities. The types of activities supported by the funds are on-going School Improvement Team activities and meetings; professional development; instructional resources; materials and supplies; instructional technology and software; salaries; and fringe benefits.

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

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

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

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

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	77
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	107
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	39938
Who applied to transfer	2584
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	2397

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

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

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	\$ 679122
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	4
<b>Comments:</b> The four LEAs in this sections are Evangeline, Madison, St. Helena, and The City of Baker. They are unable to provide Public School Choice due to 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.	

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.<sup>3</sup>
- 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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	45
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	18044
Who applied for supplemental educational services	5183
Who received supplemental educational services	4212
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	\$ 4559883
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	173854	145477	83.7	28377	16.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	20638	17602	85.3	3036	14.7
Low-poverty schools	19834	18959	95.6	875	4.4
All elementary schools	81875	73931	90.3	7944	9.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	24945	16647	66.7	8298	33.3
Low-poverty schools	24002	21184	88.3	2818	11.7
All secondary schools	91979	71546	77.8	20433	22.2
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Louisiana Department of Education uses the departmentalized approach; elementary classrooms are counted multiple times once for each core content subject that is taught.
---

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

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

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	29.6
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	6.7
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	63.7
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	36.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	8.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	55.4
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	85.9	52.2
Poverty metric used	Poverty Quartiles are based the number of students that qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch.	
Secondary schools	71.3	38.8
Poverty metric used	Poverty Quartiles are based the number of students that qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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
3	Dual language	Spanish	85.0	15.0
0	Two-way immersion			
4	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	70.0	30.0
2	Developmental bilingual	Spanish	97.0	3.0
0	Heritage language			
7	Sheltered English instruction			
10	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
15	Content-based ESL			
19	Pull-out ESL			
19	Other (explain)			
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

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

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

	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	8058
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	7015
Vietnamese	2240
Arabic	607
Cherokee	437
Chinese Cantonese Mandarin Zhongwen	429

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

**Comments:**

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

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

#### 1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

##### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

##### Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

<b>ALL LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	10261
Not tested/State annual ELP	936
Subtotal	11197
LEP/One Data Point	4418
<b>Comments:</b> Typically, the summary data of total number of LEP students taking LEAP ELA includes students who are in districts that do not receive Title III funds. Louisiana's data may not include both groups during this reporting cycle. We will correct this and prepare it for submission to OELA.	

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

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

**1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status**

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

**Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:**

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

<b>Title III LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	8980
Not tested/State annual ELP	805
Subtotal	9785
LEP/One Data Point	3536
<b>Comments:</b> Louisiana test administrators can provide regular assessment documents for the students to test but they can be excused from testing for different reasons.	

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

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

**1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results**

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

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

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

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

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	79.7	146	1.5	N
No progress		5242		
ELP attainment	40.4	569	5.7	N
<b>Comments:</b>				

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	79.7	137	1.6	N
No progress		4916		
ELP attainment	40.4	475	5.4	N
<b>Comments:</b> And the only other reason I can give is that				
In current Louisiana policy, once a student passes the language proficiency exam, the districts do not have to continue to test the students. However, the students are still considered LEP and continue to test in the state assessment until they reach proficiency. We have since learned that this process must be modified.				

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

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

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



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

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

**1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility**

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

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	#
Total MFLEP	1219
MFLEP/AYP grades	980
<b>Comments:</b> Historically the AYP grades were 4,8, & 10 (HS). Recently we included grades 3-8, & 10 (HS). Therefore, the total MFLEP would be larger than the total in the AYP grades because of which students are excluded in the AYP count.	

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	2713
LEP HS/Non-AYP	1218
LEP other grades	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students**

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
803	351	1154
<b>Comments:</b> Some of the students have changed schools from one year to the next. Also the number of Title III districts changes, therefore the student counts change from one year to the next.		

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
553	395	71.4	158

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:** Many students move throughout the school year, or are not tested for an reason which is indicated on their test record. Historically the AYP grades were 4,8, & 10 (HS). Recently we included grades 3-8, & 10 (HS). Therefore, the total MFLEP would be larger than the total in the AYP grades because of which students are excluded in the AYP count.

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
553	385	69.6	168

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:** Many students move throughout the school year, or are not tested for an reason which is indicated on their test record. Historically the AYP grades were 4,8, & 10 (HS). Recently we included grades 3-8, & 10 (HS). Therefore, the total MFLEP would be larger than the total in the AYP grades because of which students are excluded in the AYP count.

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	30
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	26
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	26
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2248	1009	20

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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

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

### 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	150
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.	142
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	182

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	25	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	24	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	13	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	10	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	9	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	21	2801
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	17	396
PD provided to principals	19	436
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	19	280
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	17	359
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	5	337
Total		4609
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	08/17/06	47
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.

Louisiana plans to seek approval from our State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) based on tentative allocations prior to July 1 so that once approved subgrantees can begin to access their funding at any time once the fiscal year has begun. This would shorten the distribution process by eliminating a potential waiting period of 47 days.
--

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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	64.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	55.0
Hispanic	62.0
White, non-Hispanic	72.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	25.0
Limited English proficient	60.0
Economically disadvantaged	59.0
Migratory students	62.0
Male	57.0
Female	71.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	6.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9.0
Hispanic	7.1
White, non-Hispanic	5.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10.6
Limited English proficient	6.9
Economically disadvantaged	7.1
Migratory students	6.8
Male	8.2
Female	5.5
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	61	58
LEAs with subgrants	13	13
Total	74	71
<b>Comments:</b>		

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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1006	560
K	1226	1974
1	1376	2075
2	1194	1816
3	1126	1765
4	1146	1748
5	1044	1547
6	995	1526
7	1034	1351
8	939	1369
9	1015	1450
10	690	1030
11	555	847
12	539	804
Ungraded	12	343
Total	13897	20205
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	724	1835
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6229	13808
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	6740	4229
Hotels/Motels	204	333
Total	13897	20205
<b>Comments:</b>		

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)	593
K	1976
1	2077
2	1818
3	1767
4	1750
5	1550
6	1526
7	1352
8	1369
9	1450
10	1033
11	847
12	805
Ungraded	343
Total	20256
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	156
Migratory children/youth	108
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1907
Limit English proficient students	1052
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**Comments:** Other educational support services reported by subgrantees are 1)Family and parental involvement activities including family academic nights / parent assisted learning etc. 2) employment and training for parents 3) Automatic inclusion in an after-school program and Monday (our day out of school) in the 5th day project 4)case management for homeless families and assistance for community activities for children/youth i.e. recreational programs sports 5)summer enrichment program food distribution and 6)other clothing and jacket vouchers city bus tickets Christmas gift vouchers and children's books.

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	3
2. School Selection	4
3. Transportation	4
4. School records	3
5. Immunizations	3
6. Other medical records	2
7. Other Barriers	2

**Comments:** Other barriers reported by subgrantees are inadequate funding and the occasional difficulty in providing transportation when there is dissimilarity between two nearby school systems.

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	533	343
4	1403	819
5	491	319
6	421	299
7	397	275
8	1017	571
High School	1171	780
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	582	318
4	1405	704
5	493	297
6	426	277
7	399	273
8	1020	645
High School	1155	666
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	313
K	281
1	319
2	273
3	247
4	305
5	243
6	247
7	236
8	230
9	216
10	131
11	114
12	119
Ungraded	107
Out-of-school	211
Total	3592
<b>Comments:</b>	

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 FFY 2005-06 child count was 4322. The FFY 2006-2007 child count is 3592. This represents a difference of 730 students a 17% decrease in the Category 1 child count. A comparison of the data between FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 reveals that there was an increase in the number of students reaching the end of their three-year eligibility for MEP and a decrease in the number of students who graduated. Also the two 2005 hurricanes (Katrina and Rita) that devastated so many parts of the state and surrounding Gulf coast states contributed to a decrease in the number of migrant families working in Louisiana. In the areas of the state where the 2005 hurricanes had the greatest storm devastation for example Orleans Parish St. Bernard Parish Jefferson Parish Plaquemines Parish Lafourche Parish Terrebonne Parish Assumption Parish Acadia Parish Cameron Parish Calcasieu Parish and Jefferson Davis Parish many of the industries that employ migrant families have also continued to be greatly impacted through 2007.

**Migrant Category 1 Child Count Examples of Increases/Decreases**

FFY 2005 FFY 2006

End of Eligibility - 52 End of Eligibility - 303

Number of Graduates - 113 Number of Graduates - 54

Students Who Have Moved - 803 Students Who Have Moved - 457

Comparison of FFY 2005 and 2006 data reveal that every LOA in Louisiana experienced a decrease in its MEP Category 1 child count. The Department surveyed its MEP local operating agencies regarding reasons for the decline of migrant students in each region. Their responses are as follows:

⌘ Many of the migrant families are no longer working in migrant occupations. They have secured work in such areas as welding construction/roofing businesses and yard work.

⌘ There was a large exodus of fishing families from the fishing industry parishes of Orleans and St. Bernard and the families never returned.

⌘ A substantial number of families did not return to hurricane affected areas due to the severe housing shortage and lack of migratory work.

⌘ In the Hurricane Rita ravaged Cameron Parish homes and all schools were destroyed; therefore migrant families evacuated and many never returned.

⌘ Many Hispanic workers (men) have moved into several areas throughout the state to perform agricultural work but did not bring their families with them.

⌘ Migrant status changed for many families who found employment with other businesses that paid better salaries for example the big bonuses gained by working at fast food restaurants (McDonalds/Burger King) after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

⌘ Farms and cotton gins have closed permanently or down-sized due to unfavorable economic conditions.

⌘ The high cost of fuel has made it difficult for families to move to areas where work is available.

⌘ The "migrant" status for many families has changed due to their permanent relocation in certain areas.

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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	126
K	75
1	100
2	79
3	88
4	100
5	68
6	76
7	84
8	79
9	55
10	43
11	32
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	48
Total	1056
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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



**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The FFY 2005 Category 2 child count was 2170. The FFY 2006 Category 2 child count is 1056. This represents a difference of 1114 students a 49% decrease in the Category 2 child count. The factors affecting the Category 1 child count also contribute to the decrease in the Category 2 child count. The Department surveyed its MEP local operating agencies regarding reasons for the decline of migrant students in each region. Their responses are as follows:

â€ Many of the migrant families are no longer working in migrant occupations. They have secured work in such areas as welding construction/roofing businesses and yard work.

â€ There was a large exodus of fishing families from the fishing industry parishes of Orleans and St. Bernard and the families never returned.

â€ A substantial number of families did not return to hurricane affected areas due to the severe housing shortage and lack of migratory work.

â€ In the Hurricane Rita ravaged Cameron Parish homes and all schools were destroyed; therefore migrant families evacuated and many never returned.

â€ Many Hispanic workers (men) have moved into several areas throughout the state to perform agricultural work but did not bring their families with them.

â€ Migrant status changed for many families who found employment with other businesses that paid better salaries for example the big bonuses gained by working at fast food restaurants (McDonalds/Burger King) after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

â€ Farms and cotton gins have closed permanently or down-sized due to unfavorable economic conditions.

â€ The high cost of fuel has made it difficult for families to move to areas where work is available.

â€ The "migrant" status for many families has changed due to their permanent relocation in certain areas.

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.

Louisiana used the MIS 2000 student information system to generate its Category 1 and Category 2 child count. We refer to our system as MERIL-2 (Migrant Education Records in Louisiana-Version 2). This system was used to calculate the 2005-2006 child count and the 2006-2007 child count. The MERIL-2 data system will continue to be used to collect the state's migrant data in 2007-2008.

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.

MEP staff (recruiters and advocates) initially recruits migrant families/children through face-to-face interviews and via telephone. MEP staff updates existing COEs through verification process that can include face-to-face interviews, via telephone, a review of schools records, etc. When children are first recruited all of their Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data is entered in MERIL-2. This information includes not only parent/guardian information and qualifying work activities but also key dates such as each child's birth date the qualifying arrival date (also known as the last qualifying move date) and the residency date. In addition if the child is enrolled in school the data specialist enters the actual school enrollment date. All of these dates are used in the calculation process. In addition to COE data school histories are maintained on all migrant children entered. This is done continuously throughout the year. Data is collected during a student record update procedure. MEP recruiters and advocates re-interview migrant families at several times throughout the school year, including at the beginning of the school year and at the end of the eligibility. If corrections are to be made to any of the migrant student data, data specialists are notified by state staff. Corrections are made and data are updated on a weekly basis. The MERIL2 data system houses all data on migrant students in the state. The results of the interviews revealed a majority of migrant families were eligible for the MEP. No other organization was contracted to recruit and complete COEs. Data specialists record student enrollment and participation in MEP summer-term and /or intersession projects.

School enrollments are entered in Meril-2 after the advocates have verified with the schools each child's presence in the school his/her school enrollment date and his/her grade level. This is referred to as mass enrollment and is done on or after September 1 each year. A list of the children who were in each service area the previous year is provided to all advocates. The advocates check on each child on the list either with school or home visits to verify the data. This list is used to record either the school enrollment (including grade level and any school changes) or to record that the children have moved or were unable to be located. We use this process instead of securing new COEs or updating COEs on each family because it accomplishes the requirement to verify and document the presence of each child with a minimized paper work burden. In addition to the mass enrollment process at the beginning of the school year a mass withdrawal process is done much the same way at the end of the school year. When the advocates have collected all the data they sign date and return the COEs to the data specialists who enter and file the signed COEs for documentation of the student's residence. COEs are promptly completed upon identification of migrant families or children. The information from hard copies of COEs are inputted into the MERIL2 database at the local level by data entry personnel. The COE information is entered on a paper COE form at the point of recruitment by field personnel. The information from hard copies of summer/inter-session project records is entered into the MERIL2 database at the local level by data entry personnel.

The advocates also update school histories throughout the year through movement notification forms submitted to the data specialist. The advocates submit the forms giving children's names date moved etc. The data specialists enter the movement dates as the withdrawal dates and termination date in MERIL-2 and file the forms in the students' folders. Summer school enrollments are noted on the individual child's needs assessment form. Those forms are submitted to the data specialists who enter the summer school line and service provided and file the form in the students' folders. MEP recruiters and advocates perform a re-interview of migrant families at several times throughout the school year including at the beginning of the school year and at the end of the eligibility. MEP recruiters and advocates will update student information and eligibility as appropriate, based on conversations held during other home visits. LOAs print out a copy of a master list of migrant students from the migrant database which can be generated monthly, annually, as well as at the end of project period. This is an on-going function within the LOAs. Mass enrollment procedures are standard operating procedures.

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.

All of the MEP student data is run entirely from the Meril-2 data system. Data Specialists from each of the eight regions (LOAs) enter all of the pertinent migrant data into the Meril-2 system. The data is uploaded to the state server where the state staff reviews all COEs and other migrant data as appropriate. If corrections are to be made to any of the migrant student data Data Specialists are notified by state staff and corrections are duly made and updated on a weekly basis. The MERIL2 data system houses all data on migrant students in the state.

At present the MERIL-2 data system houses all the appropriate migrant data on migrant students in the state. Currently the state is working on plans for an interface of the MERIL-2 data system with the state student information system for child count purposes at the state level.

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.

Not applicable.

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

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

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The first step in ensuring only eligible students are counted is our ongoing quality control check of COEs. A statewide network of recruiters is the cornerstone for the entire process. Working regionally to ensure that every geographic region of the state is canvassed recruiters ascertain and document the eligibility of every child to be enrolled in the Migrant Education Program. A Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for each qualifying family recording the name birth date and other significant data for each child. The COE serves a double purpose; not only does it document the eligibility for each child determined to qualify for the MEP in Louisiana but it also provides the source for relevant data to be entered into the MERIL-2 data base system. The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the COEs are verified through a quality control process that has been in place since 1989. This process began with thorough training of recruiters who are provided technical assistance and periodic updating on statutory or regulatory changes. Every COE is checked by state level staff assuring that all required information has been provided. Any children determined to be ineligible for the Migrant Education Program are removed from the data base. In this way we know all children in the data base had a qualifying activity.

In calculating the count of eligible students for the subject year only students who meet the program eligibility guidelines are counted using several mathematical checks that are utilized to ensure that children are within the eligible age range and had a documented residency during the period. MERIL-2 calculates fields of LQM3 (last qualifying move date plus three years) twenty-second birth date (birth date plus twenty-two years) and third birth date (birth date plus three years). The counting program selects only children who resided in the state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1/06-8/31/07) whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 9/1/06 whose third date is less than or equal to 8/31/07 whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date. The residency determination is made by selecting only children whose funding date (school enrollment date or generated date of residency date for students not in school) is between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07 residency date is between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07 withdrawal date is between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07 or termination date is between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07.

The summer report selects children who received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term and whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 5/25/07 whose twenty-second birth date is greater than or equal to 5/26/07 whose third birth date is less than or equal to 8/13/07 whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date or termination is null whose third birth date is less than or equal to the withdrawal date or the withdrawal date is null whose enrollment date was between 5/26/07 and 8/13/07 and whose enrollment type was S (summer). The earliest began on 5/26/07 and the latest ended 8/13/07. If the service was not entered the data specialist enters it. If the enrollment was entered in error it is removed.

MERIL-2 assures that students are counted only once per child count category by assigning each child a unique student sequence number. If a child has multiple school history lines that fit the funding criteria MERIL-2 only counts the student sequence number once. A home visit is conducted with a family each year to confirm residency. MEP recruiters and advocates telephone families and check school/program attendance records or data to confirm residency.

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.

Not applicable.

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.

We ensure that students qualify before they are entered into the MERIL-2 system. The quality control process for checking COEs takes place within a period of 48 hours or as soon as possible thereafter. Louisiana Department of Education has a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that is used statewide. We place primary importance on serving children who are most at-risk demonstrating a priority of services that include but are not limited too school year interruption illnesses large number of missed school days failure/retainment not enough school credits and other at risk factors such as low level English communication multiple moves and failure in core courses. Our commitment is to provide help to migrant students and their families when they first arrive which is when they need help the most. At the end of the COE quality control process children's records are deleted from the system if it is determined that they are ineligible. This rarely happens however because of the training and experience of our recruiters. Training is conducted at least annually on a statewide and/or local basis.

Throughout the year checks are taken by staff to ensure that no duplications exist with student records. On the LOA level the data specialist begins the process of entering COEs by conducting a search of the state database to determine whether the child is already in the system thereby avoiding duplicate entries. When similar names are encountered the operator reviews birth dates parent's names or other data to determine whether the name is new or a duplicate. If the operator determines that the name matches an existing student the record is downloaded into the regional database and updated with whatever information from the COE is new such as a more recent qualifying move or a residency in a new school district. If there is no match for the name or names on the COE the data specialist creates a new record. At the end of each working day all information is uploaded to the state database so that it exists in both sites. There is a further check at the state level to ensure that duplicate entries are avoided. When review of COEs for eligibility and accuracy is completed state staff will again search the data base for possible duplicates double-checking the initial search at the regional level. If duplicates are identified state staff will merge the two records into one and then contact the regional office to download the merged record. The student eligibility is based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult. COEs are reviewed and signed by recruiters, their supervisors, data specialists, and reviewed by staff within the state office. Incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification.

Final steps that are taken by state staff to verify child counts before they are submitted include identifying: 1) Students with matching social security numbers; 2) Students with matching date of birth and last names (excluding students marked as multiple births); 3) Students with the same first name and date of birth - but totally different last names (possibly adopted or married); 4) Students with same last names and similar date of birth.

All LOAs were instructed to verify that summer enrollments were based on programs and services provide during the actual period of summer vacation in the relevant school district. (School schedules vary from district to district). The LOAs were also instructed to keep documentation of summer services. The SEA reviews student attendance at summer/inter-session projects.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Louisiana re-interviewing process involves a three-year cycle with year one involving an external re-interview initiative. During the 2005-2006 school year in February March and April 2006 Louisiana conducted a child eligibility re-interviewing initiative. MEP recruiters and advocates obtain date from families, and conduct re-interview systematically in an approved way, i.e., face to face re-interviews, phone interviews, etc. A team of five persons who were not employed within Louisiana's MEP system were the interviewers. The results were reported in an April 2006 document submitted to the United States Department of Education. The SEA provides professional development training to all MEP staff (recruiters, advocates, data specialists, MEP coordinators, MEP directors) to ensure the validity of eligibility documentation. The SEA conducts re-interviews, through random sampling methods, that are completed by an independent contractor.

For the 2006-2007 school year (year two of this cycle) re-interviewing training was provided to SEA and LOA MEP staff by an out-of-state Identification and Recruitment consultant in January 2007. After completing training each of Louisiana's eight LOAs conducted

two voluntary re-interview sessions using their own staff during the school year. Each region chose a random number of families to re-interview and used a random sampling of COEs from the MERIL-2 data system for this purpose. The regions re-interviewed approximately 15 families during each of the two re-interview sessions. The COEs were reviewed with the families and a questionnaire was used as a testing pattern for the re-interview process. A total of 240 migrant families were re-interviewed during this process and all 240 were found to be eligible for the MEP. Documentation of the re-interview process was placed in secure files at the LOA MEP offices and was reviewed by state staff during the yearly monitoring visit.

School year 2007-2008 will be year three of the current cycle. Louisiana anticipates using re-interview sessions conducted by LOA staff and re-interview sessions conducted by peers from other LOAs. Thus Louisiana is implementing through this re-interviewing process a continuous system for testing the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations.

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.

Throughout the year regional MEP staff meet for a minimum of one day each month to review all COEs for accuracy and to ensure the timely input of data into the MERIL-2 data system. Data Specialists enter COE information into the data system on a daily basis after receiving the COE from the recruiters. The COEs are sent to the state office via fax then reviewed and compared with the electronic version via the data system. After the state staff notifies the LOA of the approved COEs LOA data specialists maintain continuous contact with recruiters/advocates to update COEs and student records as appropriate.

The state office is solely responsible for the merging of duplicate student records. As duplicate records are discovered data specialists provide the state with a list of migrant student records that should be merged. State staff performs the merge of records then checks within the data system to ensure that records have been merged successfully. The regional data specialists are informed of the merge. Data Specialists are diligent in their work to consistently review and perform the data check that is required for the continuous correct and timely input of COE information into the MERIL-2 system. The SEA periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises procedures. The SEA Migrant database generates random systematic sampling of migrant records.

Written procedures are provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data. Data management training, including updated training, is provided to data personnel four times each school year, including summer session, to address data input, report building and retrieval of reports.

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.

Before the submission of the Category 1 and Category 2 child count data for federal reporting state staff runs several reports of both of the child counts as well as compares the reports to a list of the students for each child count. Staff reviews each report for accuracy to promote error free reporting. The Category 1 and Category 2 child counts are reviewed by the state Data Management staff and the MEP State Director to further provide an additional review of the data that will be submitted.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The results of the 2006-2007 voluntary re-interview process revealed a 0% defect rate. Therefore Louisiana did not implement any corrective actions. However the state will provide continuous recruiter/advocates trainings with additional updates on the regulations in the area of the identification and recruitment of eligible migrant students. Each LOA will continue its efforts to properly re-interview a random sampling of migrant families to ensure compliance with eligibility requirements. During year three of its re-interview

process cycle the state will conduct an independent re-interview of randomly selected migrant families in accordance with federal rules and regulations.

A handbook has been updated and distributed to recruiters and advocates. Random samplings of migrant student records (COEs and Needs Assessments) are reviewed as part of the regular SEA monitoring process.

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

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

In the space below, 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.

Beginning in August 2005 and continuing through 2007 the Louisiana Department of Education has taken many steps to evaluate its data management systems in light of the impact of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on the fluctuating population of the state. The southern half of the state continues to experience a higher than normal mobility in its population including enrollments of children during the regular school year and in summer programs. The state's migrant population already noteworthy for its mobility is even more challenging to count and track.

This challenge in data management and accuracy of reporting created by the hurricanes of 2005 continues to be a concern that Louisiana will address. Future analysis of multi-year trend data will enable the Department to determine more conclusively errors in accuracy of data versus fluctuations in data due to the effects of natural disaster and long-term recovery.

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

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