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

MASSACHUSETTS

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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Massachusetts

Address:
350 Main St.
Malden, MA 02148

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Robert Curtin

Telephone: 781-338-3582

Fax: 781-338-6850

e-mail: rcurtin@doe.mass.edu

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Jeffrey Nellhaus

_____   __Friday, March 28, 2008, 3:34:41 PM__
  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.

The Massachusetts Department of Education (MDOE) has previously submitted to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) extensive documentation related to the development of the current Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Going forward, the Massachusetts Board of Education (the Board) has launched a five-year cycle of review and revision/refinement of the frameworks. For English Language Arts, the review process has begun in fall 2007 and consideration of proposed amendments is planned for spring 2008. For Mathematics, the review process is scheduled to begin in winter 2008 and the consideration of proposed amendments is planned for fall 2008. For Science and Technology/Engineering, the review process is scheduled to begin in fall 2008 and the consideration of proposed amendments is planned for spring 2009.

The article discussing the Board's actions can be found at http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/news.asp?id=3600. Future actions by the Board can be found at the Board's homepage at http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe.

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

If the State has <u>not</u> 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.

No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to achievement standards made or planned.

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

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

1.1.4 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.

Massachusetts Science assessments in grades 5 and 8 have been fully operational since spring 2003. MDOE has previously submitted to USDOE extensive documentation related to Science assessments in grades 5 and 8.

Massachusetts implemented fully operational high school Science assessments in spring 2007. End-of-course tests were successfully implemented in Biology, Chemistry, Introductory Physics, and Technology/Engineering. Performance standards were set in summer 2007. Full reporting of results occurred in fall 2007 at the student, school, district, and state levels.

MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt) is also administered on a fully operational basis in Science. MCAS-Alt is primarily intended for severely cognitively disabled students who are unable to participate in MCAS with or without accommodations (as determined by the student's IEP Team). Massachusetts annually conducts the statewide MCAS-Alt which consists of a portfolio of materials collected during the school year by the teacher and student.

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.

MDOE has previously submitted to USDOE documentation related to the implementation of academic achievement standards for Science assessments in grades 5 and 8.

For the high school Science assessments that became operational in spring 2007 performance level definitions were finalized in summer 2007. Standard-setting panelists were recruited and standard setting was conducted for the high school Science assessments in summer 2007. Student performance was fully reported in fall 2007 at four performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Failing. Results were reported at the student, school, district, and state levels. Student performance on MCAS-Alt is judged and reported according to standard MCAS performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, and Needs Improvement with performance at the lowest MCAS performance level Failing subdivided into four discrete levels: Progressing, Emerging, Awareness, and Incomplete. Performance levels on the MCAS-Alt were established based upon a methodology that uses scoring rubrics to evaluate student performance on four dimensions: completeness, complexity, accuracy, and independence.

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

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

1.2 **PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	511225	509170	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1518	1506	99.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	24135	24085	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	41984	41749	99.4
Hispanic	66686	66268	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	367216	366260	99.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	90542	89817	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25561	25432	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	154499	153669	99.5
Migratory students	83	83	100.0
Male	263154	262221	99.7
Female	247717	246949	99.7
Comments: The number of students tested in the LEP subgroup is larger than the number that received a proficiency level because first year LEP students are tested and counted as assessed but do not receive a proficiency level. More information on this topic can be found at: http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/participation/?section=lep			

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	10707	11.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	71538	79.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	183	0.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7261	8.1
Total	89689	
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.		

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	511534	509671	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1520	1514	99.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	24085	24034	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	42038	41862	99.6
Hispanic	66726	66357	99.5
White, non-Hispanic	367486	366624	99.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	90755	90140	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25352	25158	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	154770	154034	99.5
Migratory students	83	83	100.0
Male	263379	262506	99.7
Female	247805	247165	99.7
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9960	11.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72907	81.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	104	0.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7050	7.8
Total	90021	
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.		

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71323	42620	59.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	103	51.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3454	2435	70.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5575	1951	35.0
Hispanic	9648	3302	34.2
White, non-Hispanic	50892	33939	66.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12365	3419	27.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4805	1435	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22299	8442	37.9
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36728	22039	60.0
Female	34561	20571	59.5
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71311	42076	59.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	93	45.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3456	2226	64.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5577	1984	35.6
Hispanic	9641	3082	32.0
White, non-Hispanic	50888	33798	66.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12390	3309	26.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4799	1047	21.8
Economically disadvantaged students	22293	8039	36.1
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36704	20606	56.1
Female	34577	21462	62.1
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70645	33908	48.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	70	30.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3386	2126	62.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5433	1217	22.4
Hispanic	9238	2191	23.7
White, non-Hispanic	50847	27552	54.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12858	2246	17.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3943	721	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	21841	5873	26.9
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36269	17539	48.4
Female	34348	16365	47.6
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate. The data for Migratory students should be suppressed due to a small N size.			

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

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

1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70516	39423	55.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	232	98	42.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3371	2123	63.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5436	1707	31.4
Hispanic	9220	2613	28.3
White, non-Hispanic	50750	32050	63.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12826	2449	19.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3917	667	17.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21823	6819	31.3
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36214	18093	50.0
Female	34277	21324	62.2
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate. The data for Migratory students should be suppressed due to a small N size.			

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

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

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71352	36526	51.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	91	45.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3453	2422	70.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5560	1432	25.8
Hispanic	9224	2352	25.5
White, non-Hispanic	51493	29538	57.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13249	2282	17.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3254	604	18.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21838	6335	29.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36843	19388	52.6
Female	34459	17130	49.7
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71325	44711	62.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	101	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3438	2325	67.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5561	2169	39.0
Hispanic	9209	3105	33.7
White, non-Hispanic	51500	36179	70.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13254	3373	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3235	517	16.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21871	8377	38.3
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36838	21506	58.4
Female	34445	23195	67.3
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72889	38461	52.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	74	32.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3337	2383	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6091	1618	26.6
Hispanic	9336	2310	24.7
White, non-Hispanic	52421	31332	59.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13618	2245	16.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2700	415	15.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22492	6521	29.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	37588	19742	52.5
Female	35259	18712	53.1
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

1.3.8 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72901	48884	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	117	51.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3328	2410	72.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6109	2581	42.3
Hispanic	9312	3503	37.6
White, non-Hispanic	52451	39309	74.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13657	3694	27.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2657	404	15.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22514	9593	42.6
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	37595	23260	61.9
Female	35267	25616	72.6
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73592	33559	45.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	223	65	29.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3341	2139	64.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6105	1188	19.5
Hispanic	9403	1788	19.0
White, non-Hispanic	53212	27823	52.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13230	1548	11.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2511	263	10.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22659	4939	21.8
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	38120	17326	45.5
Female	35429	16227	45.8
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73578	51040	69.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	125	56.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3337	2490	74.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6105	2925	47.9
Hispanic	9397	3924	41.8
White, non-Hispanic	53223	40683	76.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13247	3649	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2479	381	15.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22660	10527	46.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	38108	24155	63.4
Female	35434	26869	75.8
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74319	33546	45.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	75	31.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3164	2039	64.4
Black, non-Hispanic	6397	1215	19.0
Hispanic	9358	1684	18.0
White, non-Hispanic	53967	28023	51.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13120	1226	9.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2490	251	10.1
Economically disadvantaged students	22173	4775	21.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	38389	17110	44.6
Female	35872	16430	45.8
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

1.3.12 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74433	55989	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	235	161	68.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3162	2453	77.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6412	3530	55.1
Hispanic	9403	4474	47.6
White, non-Hispanic	54024	44483	82.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	13179	4744	36.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2477	426	17.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22257	12060	54.2
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	38446	27131	70.6
Female	35925	28835	80.3
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

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

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71692	49402	68.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	100	54.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3258	2677	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5945	2670	44.9
Hispanic	8279	3485	42.1
White, non-Hispanic	52917	39763	75.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11241	3450	30.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2213	600	27.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17910	8481	47.4
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36328	24872	68.5
Female	35272	24500	69.5
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate. The data for Migratory students should be suppressed due to a small N size.			

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	72471	50986	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	115	61.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3297	2446	74.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6053	2823	46.6
Hispanic	8493	3627	42.7
White, non-Hispanic	53315	41224	77.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11465	3390	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2258	278	12.3
Economically disadvantaged students	18293	8639	47.2
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	36767	24116	65.6
Female	35596	26834	75.4
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate. The data for Migratory students should be suppressed due to a small N size.			

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

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

1.4   SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1772	919	51.9
Districts	386	116	30.1
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> 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	1015	451	44.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	457	133	29.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	558	318	57.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
345	93	27.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Massachusetts Department of Education (MDOE) has prioritized support to districts with multiple schools with NCLB status. The MDOE provides a range of support to these districts that includes:

1. Assistance in the development of data driven intervention plans for schools in Corrective Action and Restructuring in the aggregate.

2. Thirty 3-day leadership development institutes for principals and other district leaders through the National Institute of Leadership Development.

3. Prioritized funding and support for early reading programming and mathematics formative assessment.

4. Opportunities for teachers and teacher leaders to participate in extensive mathematics content training.

5. Targeted year-long teacher training for English as a Second Language licensure and ESL curriculum development.

In addition, in 2006-2007 the MDOE provided targeted assistance to school and district leaders of schools in Restructuring and Corrective Action in the aggregate. MDOE staff and consultants provided onsite intervention and targeted resources aimed at advancing district and school efforts to effectively carry out a coherent program of systemic reforms and practices that improve student achievement. MDOE staff and consultants with expertise in leadership development, mathematics, literacy, and English language development collaborate (as warranted by the needs of the school) with district leadership to determine whether the design and implementation of improvement strategies were having the intended impact at the pace that was needed to make adequate yearly performance targets and to support continued improvement toward higher student achievement. Onsite support included classroom observations, participation in leadership team and teacher professional learning community meetings, delivery of specific training, and networking for district and school leaders etc. The amount of onsite assistance varied with school and district needs (as well as MDOE capacity) but averaged about 5-10 days per month per district in 2006-2007 depending on the size and number of schools in the district. In 2006-2007, MDOE provided this intensive support for approximately 45 schools.

Furthermore, in the fall of 2006 MDOE revised its regulations on Underperforming Schools and School Districts [903.C.M.R. 2.03] These regulations in subsection (8)(3) set out a series of expectations for schools in Restructuring and Corrective Action in the aggregate that provide the conditions for improving student performance. The regulations cite expectations in the following areas: teacher assignments, financial resources, teacher evaluation, curriculum content coaching, instructional time, interventions and safety nets, teacher collaboration, interim assessments, and data access and use. The state's targeted assistance used these regulations as a framework for setting expectations and providing training and support.

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	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: Data unavailable for 2006-07 school year. Data to be collected for 2007-08 school year.	

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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: Data unavailable for 2006-07 school year. Data to be collected for 2007-08 school year.	

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

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

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Twenty-seven districts were identified for corrective action in either the aggregate or for subgroups. The MDOE conducted program and financial data analysis and meetings with the Districts in Corrective Action to ensure that their current year investments were strategically directed at improving student performance in the content areas and for the student groups that led to the corrective action designation. At the meetings districts reported about the corrective actions they took over the past years to raise performance including: adopting and implementing new curriculum, replacing teachers as well as district and school leaders, delivering professional development, and instituting district-wide accountability measures to oversee the impact of their improvement efforts. The districts' Title I mid-year payments were held pending the outcome of the review. While the state did not choose to redirect funds based on this review during 2006-2007 the reviews helped better position the state and districts to strategically target 2007-2008 resources to support improved performance for identified student groups and/or in identified content areas. In addition, as stated in section 1.4.4.2 above the state's technical assistance was focused on the districts in which most of the state's schools with NCLB status were located. These districts were districts in Corrective Action as well; they received the targeted training, networking resources, and onsite assistance described in that section.

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments: Data unavailable for 2006-07 school year. Data to be collected for 2007-08 school year.	

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	10/23/07	10/23/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	8/29/07	8/29/07
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	2	1
Schools	24	9
Comments:		

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	10/17/07

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

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

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Massachusetts used Section 1003(a) funds to support low-performing Title I schools with a combination of designated state underperformance status and a federal NCLB status, and their districts in planning for implementing and sustaining specific improvement initiatives.

The State prioritized allocation of these funds based on the severity of a school's performance status specifically:

1. Schools having an existing state status of Commonwealth Priority Schools (formerly known as 'Underperforming') as well as any NCLB status; and

2. Three schools designated 'Commonwealth Pilot Schools'; that is, schools in state Underperforming status for an extended period of time of four or more years and who still had not made sufficient improvement to exit that status. These schools chose to become Pilot Schools in lieu of being declared Chronically Underperforming.

The State distributed these funds in a formula grant program entitled School Support and Intervention. Districts were allocated an amount calculated using the number of Title I eligible schools and the following school enrollment ranges: $8000 (100-400 students); $12000 (401-600 students); $15000 (above 600 students).

Districts were allowed to apply for funds exceeding allocated amounts by providing rationale and justification consistent with actions specified in plans approved by the Board of Education.

The total of grants awarded was $517012 to support improvement efforts in forty-five schools in thirteen school districts throughout the State.

The types of activities supported in the grant program included the following:

1. Supporting teams in ongoing planning around the redesign of district and school structures systems and relationships to improve student performance.

2. Building school and district capacity to improve school performance as described in District Plans for School Intervention and other school improvement plans.

3. Supporting school-level teams in reviewing and analyzing data to identify needed changes in instructional practice and outcomes.

4. Providing professional development and support for improved instructional practice and outcomes.

Funds were used for stipends, consultants, and other expenditures consistent with the activities described above as well as other uses approved in consultation with MDOE liaisons working with districts.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

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

	# Schools
Title I schools *from which* students transferred for public school choice	132
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	88
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	246162
Who applied to transfer	7888
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	5008

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$
Comments: Data unavailable for 2006-07 school year. Data to be collected for 2007-08 school year.	

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	75
Comments:	

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

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	164
Comments:	

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

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

FAQ about supplemental education services

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

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	117807
Who applied for supplemental educational services	8150
Who received supplemental educational services	7500
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 15830260
Comments:	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All schools	61563	58440	94.9	3123	5.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	11107	10166	91.5	941	8.5
Low-poverty schools	10999	10775	98.0	224	2.0
All elementary schools	43245	41378	95.7	1867	4.3
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	3470	2938	84.7	531	15.3
Low-poverty schools	5011	4802	95.8	208	4.2
All secondary schools	18318	17062	93.1	1256	6.9
Comments: The data have been verified and are correct.					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Massachusetts Department of Education counted full-day self-contained elementary classes as one class for the 2006-07 school year.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	
Comments: These data are not available for the 2006-07 school year. The Massachusetts Department of Education has instituted an educator-level collection for the 2007-08 school year and will be able to provide these data going forward.	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	**Low-Poverty Schools** (less than what %)
Elementary schools	52.7	7.1
Poverty metric used	Free/Reduced Price Lunch percentage.	
Secondary schools	52.6	7.2
Poverty metric used	Free/Reduced Price Lunch percentage.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	**OLOI**
11	Dual language	Portuguese and Spanish	50.0	50.0
	Two-way immersion			
9	Transitional bilingual	Cape Verdean, Spanish and Portuguese		
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
	Sheltered English instruction			
55	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
	Content-based ESL			
	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			

Comments: Dual language: Though there is some variation from district to district, most dual language programs use an alternating week schedule, i.e. Week A in English and Week B in Spanish.

Transitional bilingual: The amount of instructional time in English and the native language depends on the English language proficiency level of the students enrolled. Therefore, it is possible for some students to be enrolled in bilingual classes for the entire day and for others to be in a general classroom for part of the day and TBE for the other part of the day.

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

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	50925
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	34681
Portuguese	5250
Khmer	2663
Creole (Haitian)	2415
Vietnamese	2131

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	44845
Not tested/State annual ELP	7962
Subtotal	52807
LEP/One Data Point	18007
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

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

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	42294
Not tested/State annual ELP	5875
Subtotal	48169
LEP/One Data Point	17728
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	60.0	17714	62.0	Y
No progress		10857		
ELP attainment	44.0	11707	48.0	Y
Comments:				

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

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

MFLEP	Yes
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:

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

	#
Total MFLEP	20502
MFLEP/AYP grades	12895
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	21638
LEP HS/Non-AYP	9449
LEP other grades	41
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments:	

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	None
4	None
5	None
6	None
7	None
8	None
HS	Spanish
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Grade	Language
3	None
4	None
5	None
6	None
7	None
8	None
HS	None
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
409	55	13.4
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
12258	8244	20502
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12844	4978	38.8	7866

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12687	5950	46.9	6737

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: There were some students that were tested in one subject or the other, and as result the total for each subject is not equal to the grand total of MFLEP students tested.

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	52
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	11
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	29
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	29
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	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	9
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	32
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	32
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments: Although there are 56 total subgrantees, only 52 are included in this analysis because two years of performance data are needed to make a determination. Four subgrantees did not receive grants in the 2005-06 school year and are not included in the data above.	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
21655	239	1

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

Comments: In response to the Attachment T conditions governing Massachusetts' Title III Part A Grant Award made on July 1, 2007, MA awarded one immigrant student grant, to one district that experienced the greatest growth in the percentage of immigrant students.

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	Yes	Multi-year	No
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	No	Formula	Yes

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments: These data are unavailable for the 2006-07 school year and will not be provided. The Massachusetts Department of Education will begin collecting data to answer this question in the 2007-08 school year.

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 <u>only</u> the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	56	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	56	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	15	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	2	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	56	2646
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	56	
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community-based organization personnel		
Total		2646
Comments: All fifty-six Title III subgrantees expended Title III funds for professional development. The number of participants includes both content and LEP classroom teachers that received professional development.		

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	07/03/06	2
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

The State has taken steps to shorten its process for distributing its Title III funds to subgrantees. For the 07-08 distribution, the State has revised its subgrantee application process, which now requires less information from subgrantees on their local plans.

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

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	69.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	64.4
Hispanic	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	85.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	61.1
Limited English proficient	54.5
Economically disadvantaged	62.3
Migratory students	
Male	76.4
Female	83.5
Comments: Massachusetts did not calculate a graduation rate for migrant students because the cohort size was so small.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6.8
Hispanic	7.9
White, non-Hispanic	2.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5.1
Limited English proficient	9.5
Economically disadvantaged	5.5
Migratory students	
Male	3.8
Female	2.8
Comments: Massachusetts did not calculate a dropout rate for the migrant students because the N size is so small.	

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	368	324
LEAs with subgrants	21	20
Total	389	344
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	66	421
K	191	975
1	222	757
2	212	748
3	213	727
4	168	643
5	226	708
6	192	616
7	250	630
8	264	631
9	363	636
10	264	496
11	256	385
12	246	357
Ungraded	0	0
Total		
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1453	4358
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1536	4012
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	<N	172
Hotels/Motels	117	188
Total		
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	538
K	604
1	695
2	693
3	690
4	615
5	677
6	595
7	612
8	636
9	670
10	542
11	420
12	369
Ungraded	0
Total	
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	373
Migratory children/youth	987
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1686
Limit English proficient students	64
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

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

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

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	5
2. School Selection	5
3. Transportation	8
4. School records	3
5. Immunizations	4
6. Other medical records	1
7. Other Barriers	8
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	373	76
4	375	43
5	363	67
6	282	70
7	297	76
8	308	96
High School	228	65
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	306	50
4	369	39
5	266	49
6	303	<N
7	300	<N
8	298	<N
High School	224	63
Comments:		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do <u>not</u> include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	68
K	<N
1	<N
2	<N
3	<N
4	<N
5	<N
6	<N
7	<N
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	399
Total	666
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of Category 1 children reported for program year 2005 - 2006 was 1,070 and the number of Category I children being reported for 2006 - 2007 is 666, a reduction of 404 children.

The reduction in the number of children identified for the program year 2006 - 2007 is attributed to several factors. First, the United State's enforcement of illegal immigration has had a significant effect on the number of migrant families willing to come forward to be interviewed for eligibility. Second, families that traditionally travel to the Western Region (Springfield, Holyoke, Northampton, Massachusetts) did not arrive as they normally do between April and August. The tobacco growers in western Massachusetts and in Connecticut either reduced or stopped production. Third, the cranberry growers, major employers in the Southeast Region, stopped production because too many cranberries were already in storage. The fishing industry, the other major employer of migrant workers in the Southeast Region, has been hurt by the restrictions placed on the fishing industry. Fourth, the North Central Region has been affected by the restrictions in the fishing industry and by the downsizing of employees in food and fish processing plants.

In addition, a growing number of employers have determined that securing contracted workers is a more cost efficient and a more manageable way for them to accomplish the necessary work. For the fourth year, Massachusetts has seen an increase in the number of emancipated youth who have come to the Commonwealth and who have been hired by temporary agencies to do migrant eligible work. These youth, for the most part, are single young men.

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

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do <u>not</u> include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	<N
K	<N
1	<N
2	<N
3	<N
4	<N
5	<N
6	<N
7	<N
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	46
Total	151
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of Category 2 children reported for program year 2005 - 2006 was 318 and the number of Category 2 children reported for program year 2006 - 2007 is 151, a reduction of 167 children served in the State's MMEP summer projects.

The number of children served in the MMEP summer projects has declined markedly. This drop is due to (a) the reduction in the eligible pool, (b) the addition of mandatory summer school programs organized by Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in response to statewide assessments of children who do not test well on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), and (c) parental decisions to enroll children in recreational programs rather than the MMEP programs during the summer.

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.

Massachusetts used a proprietary student information system which was developed exclusively for the Migrant Education Program using FileMaker Pro software.

The child counts for the previous year were generated using the same system.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The identification and recruitment of migrant children is the primary role of Community Liaisons and is conducted twelve months a year. The Community Liaisons make the initial direct contact with the potentially eligible migrant family, obtain eligibility information, and have the primary responsibility for the determination and documentation of student eligibility.

Day-to-day supervision of the Community Liaisons and implementation of identification and recruitment efforts are the responsibility of the MMEP's three Regional Directors, who are, in turn, assisted by a team leader or "verifier" who helps with the verification of all paperwork submitted. Primary responsibility for system planning, policy, and interstate/intrastate coordination is assigned to the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator who is directly supervised by the State Director. Through this structure, the identification and recruitment component provides for regional supervision and coordination of identification and recruitment (Community Liaisons) while maintaining a centralized planning and monitoring system designed to ensure strict compliance with federal student eligibility requirements.

When potentially eligible migrant families have been located, the Community Liaisons ascertain eligibility through structured face-to-face interviews with the parents or guardians or with the emancipated youth. When recruiting in urban centers for families who have ceased to migrate but remain eligible for program services, Community Liaisons must assess the validity of the information gathered. This assessment may include contacting employers, reviewing industry surveys, and contacting community-based social service agencies. Once eligibility is determined, Community Liaisons complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and submit it for review and verification by the Regional Director and his/her "verifier." Starting in 2006-2007, this documentation will be reviewed once again by the ID Coordinator who validates the paperwork with desk audits and face-to face interviews of families and/or emancipated youth who have been declared eligible.

At the point of identification, the Community Liaisons are required to recognize the family as being "new", "adding additional children" who joined the family after the LQM, or "enrolled previously." Between September and February each year, Community Liaisons interview each active eligible family during a face-to-face meeting to recheck and update the information on the COE.

The Community Liaisons are required to complete paper COE data sections on family (ethnicity, home language, father's last name, mother's last name, current address, current telephone number, school district), child[ren] (name, sex, birth date, school, grade, special services) and qualifying eligibility (date children moved from last city and date they arrived in current city, who they moved with or joined), in the case of an emancipated youth, (all information mentioned above and the date they moved and arrived is noted) who is doing temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing activity, date employment was sought or obtained, name of employer), and other clarifying information.

Community Liaisons are required to complete a data section on the standard COE on "Previous Qualifying Move(s), Activities, Address(es)." This provides information in addition to the LQM --- not only to substantiate the eligibility and to document residency, but also to identify families who may have made a migrant move within the Commonwealth and across programmatic Regions. This measure and other verification and validation measures are implemented to preclude the duplication of a family in the program's database.

The Pupil Records Coordinator searches "family last name and first"; "similar name"; "English cognates"; "addresses and telephone numbers." Then the Pupil Records Coordinator searches "student names";" birth dates"; and "parents' names." If the Pupil Records Coordinator finds a single match, she then "pulls" the COE from the file drawer, reviews it, and checks the signatures.

After determining the Category I childcount, the data for the Category 2 childcount is collected by looking at all students who received services after the last day of the regular school year and before the first day of the new school year. The data contained in this Report refer to activities documented between September 1, 2006 and August 31, 2007.

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 eligible families/students/youth are enrolled in the migrant program's principal state database at one centralized location by the MMEP Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the data directly from validated COEs (At the regional levels, data about student services, student attendance at summer programs and school year activities, health information, nutrition and transportation information, etc. are inputted. Data from the principal state database are downloaded to the regional offices on a regular basis and data from the regional office databases is uploaded on a regular basis.)

Before the Pupil Records Coordinator assigns the unique family and unique child numbers, a match search is conducted utilizing the mother's name, the names and dates of birth of the children, and a review of all records under the same last name. No new family can be enrolled into the database without this screen for duplicates. The data system that we use has a built-in capacity to use "wildcards" or single pieces of data: The discovery of a single variable, which matches a child or family, signals to the Pupil Records Coordinator that she must pull the COE and examine the information contained in it and all of the signatures. In this way, duplication of a family/child is prevented.

If the match search is negative, the new family is enrolled and a unique family number and a unique student number are assigned by the Pupil Records Coordinator.

Although the program's database can be accessed by regional staff for generating reports, the system was designed to restrict the regional staff from having the ability to enroll families/students or update eligibility information.

The Student Database consists of a collection of discrete records. Using the relational capacity of the system, it is able to track an infinite number of educational service experiences while maintaining a single unique record for each student. Student service data are collected and entered into the student enrollment record by regional staff. During the school year, Records Clerks gather the service data and enter them into an Enrollment Database which is related to the Student Database. Record Aides are assigned to each summer project site and are responsible for the collection of daily attendance, service component information, and health and health-related information.

The health and health-related information that is collected and entered into the database consists of information on: A student's allergies; medications; screenings for dental, hearing, vision, podiatric, and skin/scalp; first aid that was administered at the summer site; health exam and dental exam information; and information about health problems, names of doctors, hospitals, and clinics. In addition, information is collected and entered into the database on all academic services that a student receives at the summer project site or through home-based services.

The student information is forwarded from the Support Center to the Records Clerks located in each Regional Office. The Record Clerks enter the student information into the enrollment database, a separate and distinct relational database. The Records Clerks are required to train the Records Aides and to visit summer sites to review and monitor the work of the Records Aides.

Two distinct databases--a "student database" and an "enrollment database"- are included in the Support Center's data warehouse. The student database has been organized to ensure that there is only one record per student. The enrollment database, a related database, is used to characterize each incidence of education service. We use the records in the enrollment database to "flag" the student records for inclusion in the Category 2 child count. The student database is searched for records that meet eligibility criteria, including eligibility for service for at least one day during the report year by LQM; age-eligible; a check that the student has not been terminated before the beginning of the report period; and that the student has not turned three or has confirmation of residency after turning three during the report year. The student database is the primary generator of student counts because we can assure the "uniqueness" of each record, thereby avoiding duplication of student records in the counts.

The student database is the source for all student service data presented in reports such as OME's Category I and Category II Report. Within the student database only a single record exists for each student regardless of the number of services a student receives and despite the possibility of a student being served by more than one Massachusetts Migrant Education Program Region. In this database, an individual student cannot be counted more than once.

When migrant child counts are requested by local, state, or federal sources, the Pupil Records Coordinator conditions the query to the student database to access the information needed to respond to the inquiry. As an example, when Massachusetts needed to generate information for this Migrant Child Count Report (School Year 2006 - 2007), the Pupil Records Coordinator first queried the system for all eligible children between the ages of 3 and 21 who had not graduated from high school, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who resided in Massachusetts between September 1, 2006 and August 31, 2007. An unduplicated count of 666 Category 1 migrant children was generated from that query. The Pupil Records Coordinator then queried the system for the count of all eligible children between the ages of 3 - 21, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who received MEP-funded services between the last day of the 2005 - 2006 school year and before the first day of the 2006 - 2007 school year and who had not graduated from high school. An unduplicated count of 121 Category 2 migrant children was generated from that query. When an eligible migrant student graduates from high school, the Community Liaison completes a "Change of Status Form" which is then forwarded to the Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the student as now being "inactive" and who enters the student's graduation date as the "termination date."

Queries on the student database for Category 1 and 2 counts include an elaborate screening process. This process prevents the inclusion of three-year-olds whose residency has not been documented (after they turn three) prior to the end of the report year or

their termination date from the program. Additional screening prevents children at any age from being included in the count if their residency status has not been documented during the report year prior to termination of eligibility. If a student's eligibility expires before the summer projects begin, the student is excluded from the services that are provided during the summer projects.

Community Liaisons are alerted by the Records Clerks in advance of the date that potential Category 1 migrant children will turn three. Community Liaisons are asked to visit the family and to update the COE as soon as possible to document residency of all eligible children.

The MMEP Regional Offices, on an ongoing basis, provide migrant student lists to all LEAs that are serving migrant students. These lists "flag" the eligible migrant students to assist the LEAs to plan appropriate support for those students and to facilitate the sharing of education information by the school and MMEP region.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 Count: The Massachusetts Migrant Education Program's student database has a built-in calculation for the expiration of eligibility. To verify the accuracy of the database, on a daily basis the Pupil Records Coordinator does a "find" of active students between the ages of three through twenty-one who had not graduated from high school. If discrepancies are discovered, the Pupil Records Coordinator reviews the COEs and consults the Community Liaisons, the Records Clerks, and/or the Regional Director for a determination of eligibility on those students. All children turning three during the report period are tested for confirmation of residency after their third birthday---a face-to-face or telephone confirmation must be documented before the child's information is entered into a relational database. The same system is used for all other migrant students. For a student to be included in the twelve-month count, each one of the conditions mentioned above must be satisfied.

Category 2 Count: For a student to be included in the Category 2 count, the conditions mentioned above must be met along with one additional criterion --- that service has been provided through MEP funds (and documented in a related database) after the last day of the 2006 - 2007 school year ended and before the 2007 -2008 school year began.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The quality control system in place during the 2006-2007 program year consisted of four phases and involved at least two individuals who shared responsibility for the review and monitoring of eligibility determinations.

That system is described below:

Phase One: Quality control began with quality training. Each year Community Liaisons are required to attend (a) training sessions which review technical guides/reports, federal guidelines (eligibility, principal means of livelihood, etc.), the state Identification and Recruitment Manual and (b) additional training in interviewing techniques, information on welfare reform, education reform, access to social and human services, Child Health Insurance Program information, and other information that impacts migrant families.

Phase Two: Community Liaisons submit the completed COEs to their Regional Director. All COEs are reviewed by the Regional Directors to determine if the eligibility determination was correct and creditable and that the COE was accurate and complete. To facilitate the verification process, the Regional Directors update information on the major agricultural and fishing activities within their Region on a routine basis. If there are questions about information on COEs, the COEs are returned to the Community Liaisons for correction or further explanation.

Phase Three: Regional Directors submit their COEs to the Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator. All COEs are validated by the ID&R Coordinator to authorize student enrollment into the migrant program's student database. The review at this stage ensures that the eligibility of children considered to be migratory was properly documented and verified and that the eligibility data were creditable. If there were questions about information on the COEs, the COEs were returned to the Regional Directors for correction or further explanation.

Phase Four: The final quality control process--auditing--is done by the ID&R Coordinator on a "pre-enrollment" basis. During this phase, on a random sample basis, COEs of each Community Liaison are "field audited" (by telephone, letter, a home visit, a public school visit, and/or an employer visit) to ensure that both the identification and recruitment and information management systems are functioning properly. The ID&R Coordinator reviewed all "problematic" COEs with the MMEP State Director. It was the State Director who, in these rare cases, is the final arbitrator and determines whether the family/children are migratory and should be enrolled in the MMEP's student database.

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.

For the report period of September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007, 70% of regionally verified Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) were subject to a re-interview procedure to ensure a high level of quality control.

As stated elsewhere in this report, every COE is reviewed at the regional office and verified by the regional director. Within 5-10 days of receipt of a regionally verified COE at the Migrant Support Center, the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator or her Assistant would visit the residence or place of employment of a prospective migrant person in order to conduct a re-interview. Every re-interview session is also attended by the Community Liaison/Recruiter as well as the prospective migrant person. In the course of a re-interview session, every item recorded on the COE would be reviewed for consistency and accuracy by the re-interviewing authority. If the information on the COE is found to be consistent and accurate by the re-interviewing authority, the positive result of the re-interview session would be noted on the reverse side of the COE form (an independent form is being developed for this purpose). If the information on the COE is found to be inconsistent with the re-interview and/or found to be inaccurate, the COE is rejected and the family is deemed ineligible for services under Migrant Education. A form is completed which details the circumstances of the misidentification. The family is advised immediately of the disqualification and the family copy of the COE is handed over to them. A form is completed explaining why the family did not qualify and a copy of the COE is attached to it. A copy of

the re-interview paperwork is filed in the office of the ID & R Coordinator.

Number of eligibility determinations sampled 39

Number for which a test was completed 39

Number found eligible 34

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, the Pupil Records Coordinator (a single person acting at the State level), follows a protocol of "pulling" COEs on a random sample basis to review and verify the information in the Student Database against the COE; when entering information from the COE Update Forms into the Database, spot checks are implemented, such as a review of family and child unique numbers, and other data that have already been entered into the database; and on a daily basis manual confirmation on the eligibility expiration date of all students is completed. In addition, at the MMEP Regional Offices, the Records Clerks are reviewing COE data against COE "update data" for accuracy on an on-going basis.

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.

The final steps taken by the Pupil Records Coordinator are (1) to audit a sample of student records and pull the COEs to confirm the eligibility through an examination of the "hard copy" documentation and (2) through the system's built-in programs of "finds" and "sorts", to try to replicate the student counts by using different methodologies. All summer services provided to eligible students through MEP-funding is provided by the MMEP. Information that is reviewed throughout the year is contained in the COEs and in the MMEP permission forms.

The standard procedure for identifying the records to be included in the count relies on calculation fields in the student database which flag records that meet specific criteria via boolean operations on data in fields from the student database as well as fields from other related databases. For example one of the set of flag fields used in executing the Category 1 eligibility count, marks a record if the child's LQM was within three years of the beginning of the report period and if a termination date for that child exists, only if the termination occurred after the beginning of the report period. One strategy used to check the accuracy of that flag is to find all student records with an LQM that falls within the acceptable range for the report year. This group of records is then sorted using the flag field as well as the termination date field and any irregularities can be observed by examining each record. Although this process seems cumbersome, the sort accelerates the process. There will be a series of records, which represent active students with no termination date and, if the flag is observed to be behaving properly, these records may be dispensed with rather quickly. Similarly those records having termination dates after the beginning of the report period should also be flagged and this can rapidly be confirmed. The remaining records should not be flagged and should represent records with termination dates prior to the beginning of the report period. Due to the sort order, the borders for each series are predictable and can be readily identified. Those records in proximity to the borders may be examined more carefully for irregularities, such as unexpected flags or absence of flags. After the found set is satisfactorily examined the omitted records are sorted and examined similarly. Any flagged records in this set would indicate the existence of false positives in which an LQM would be outside of the acceptable three-year range. This is just one example of how a series of finds and sorts combined with scanning of individual records are used to confirm the validity of the compiled data.

On a semi-monthly basis throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator generates a child count report and submits it to the State Director. This report is reviewed by the State Director and the Regional Directors and compared against previous child counts and recruitment targets.

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.

As a result of Massachusetts' statewide re-interviewing initiative in 2006, the MMEP has taken steps to refine and improve upon the quality control exercised over the recruitment and identification of eligible migrant students. The revised framework for monitoring the accuracy of our work is detailed below.

Briefly described, the new framework introduces an additional layer of oversight during the work of recruiting eligible migrant children. Instead of leaving quality control exclusively in the hands of the MMEP Support Center, each region will now call upon "verifiers" to assist in the process. Verifiers will review the paperwork of the COE, confer with Regional Directors, and then together sign off on the accuracy and thoroughness of the COEs being submitted to the Support Center. The objective here, in addition, to having an extra set of "eyes" to review the paperwork is to proactively identify any potential errors and/or misidentified families well before they are declared eligible. In so doing, verifiers will also free additional time for Support Center personnel to conduct more face-to-face re-interviews of families. The need for more face-to-face re-interviews was one of the many recommendations to surface in the Statewide Director's Re-interviewing Report to OME in 2006.

The flow chart outlined in the "Conceptual Framework" calls for CLs to submit their COEs to a verifier who will then use MMEPs existing standards for quality control (revised 11/2/01) to check the COEs for accuracy.

In addition to making use of these standards, Verifiers will also complete the Regional COE Verification Form, attaching it to the COE, once reviewed. Finally, after conferring with CLs, as needed, verifiers will then confer once again with the Regional Directors before he/she signs off on the COE and sends it to the Support Center.

COEs submitted by the Regional Directors will then undergo a process of "validation" by the ID& R Coordinator and staff at the Support Center. Validation activities will, among other things, consist of telephone checks of schools and employers, and face-to-face re-interviews on a systematic basis throughout each school year. In the event that a COE and/or family is discovered to ineligible for service, Support Staff will send a MMEP "Failure to Validate Form" (and other documents) back to the Regional Director and Verifier, informing them of the change in status.

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

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

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts nor the underlying eligibility determinations upon which the counts are based.

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

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