CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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:
New Hampshire

Address:
101 Pleasant St.
Concord, NH 03301

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Deborah Connell

Telephone: 603-271-3769

Fax: 603-271-2760

e-mail: dconnell@ed.state.nh.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Lyonel B. Tracy

_____ Thursday, December 27, 2007, 3:38:22 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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned. All content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and science were approved by the NH State Board in June 2006.

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments were made or planned during 2006-2007. In keeping with New Hampshire's approved Accountability plan, 2006-2007 was a transition year for high school, so no assessment was administered. The new high school assessment was administered in October 2007.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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.

In May 2007, all students in grade 4, 8, and 11 in New Hampshire (Rhode Island and Vermont) participated in the pilot of the NECAP Science Assessment. This pilot provided an opportunity to collect baseline data on performance by all questions developed to date based on our NECAP Science Assessment Targets. During the pilot, students also had a chance to engage in the first NECAP Inquiry Task at their grade level. Feed back from the teachers and students provided valuable information for modifying the procedures and flow of the Inquiry Task and guided the development of support materials for schools and classrooms.

In May 2008, all students in grades 4, 8, and 11 will take part in the first operational NECAP Science Assessment. The assessment will be composed of 3 test sessions at each grade level. Sessions 1 and 2, will be composed of multiple choice and constructed response items from the three domains of science: Earth Space, Life and Physical Science. The questions from each domain will be clustered. Session 3 will feature and Inquiry Task at each grade level. The task has been developed using the NECAP 13 constructs of Inquiry from 1 or more NECAP Science Assessment targets that have been tagged with an Inquiry Big unifying theme. At grades 4 and 8 - they will have a hands on task (with materials) while at grade 11 the task will feature data analysis.

Based on the statistics of specific questions from the pilot and areas of limited question diversity in the question pool, new questions have been developed. In August 2007, grade level groups of teachers reviewed potential new questions for possible inclusion as an embedded field test in the first operational test. Revisions, based on teacher input and review against national standards, will refine questions. Assorted numbers of these items will be selected for field test in May 2008.

Alternative Assessment in Science through a portfolio assessment has been added to the NH ALT program. Teachers of students who are severely cognitively impaired were provided with the training needed to plan and carry out the documentation of the level of achievement for each student. These portfolios will be submitted prior to the Operational Test in May 2008.

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

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

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Approved in June 2006 was the total update of the NH Frameworks for Science Literacy K-12 which includes the Grade Span Expectations for Science and the NECAP Assessment Targets at the end of grade 4, 8, and 11. The new frameworks include Science Domains of Earth Space Science, Life Science, Physical Science and Science Process Skills. Enduring knowledge statements were highlighted from each domain and relevant strands were identified to offer districts guidance about how to structure a vertically coherent science curriculum. These indicate a sequence K-12 of science academic understanding and achievement. NECAP Assessment targets were embedded in the expectations to assure alignments and coherence of instruction with assessment on the state level. All expectations, not assessed on the state test are to be assessed at the local level.

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	94528	93819	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	344	344	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2421	2421	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1827	1827	100.0
Hispanic	2834	2814	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	86863	86272	99.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15056	14823	98.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1505	1505	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19570	19377	99.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	48857	48469	99.2
Female	45653	45350	99.3
Comments: Discrepency of 10 students between 93819 and 93829 is due to the fact that two data sets were used to generate this report. Grade 3 testing results have not been 'moved over' yet.			

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	3456	23.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10460	70.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	907	6.1
Total	14823	
Comments: Error message says that the total tested (14823) does not match the total enrolled (15056) as reported in section 1.2.1. It shouldn't. It should match the number tested (14823). There is a difference of 140 children between Table 1.2.2 and the series of 1.3.1 tables - New Hampshire will need to resolve this.		

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	94528	93694	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	344	344	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2442	2382	97.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1828	1804	98.7
Hispanic	2851	2743	96.2
White, non-Hispanic	86863	86278	99.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15056	14850	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1515	1315	86.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19570	19280	98.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	48857	48404	99.1
Female	45653	45290	99.2
Comments: There is a 12 student difference between # students tested and the data in the tables 1.3.2 - NH needs to resolve this difference. LEP - NH exercises the waiver option for first year LEP students for reading/language arts.			

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	4415	29.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9528	64.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	907	6.1
Total	14850	
Comments: Error message says that the total tested (14850) does not match the total enrolled (15056) as reported in section 1.2.1. It shouldn't. It should match the number tested (14850). There is a difference of 140 children between tables 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 - New Hampshire will need to resolve this.		

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	14942	10368	69.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	38	21	55.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	347	272	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	344	155	45.1
Hispanic	515	244	47.4
White, non-Hispanic	13643	9647	70.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1934	759	39.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	331	108	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3385	1700	50.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	7698	5465	71.0
Female	7243	4903	67.7
Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used. The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!			

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	14919	11199	75.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	25	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	339	281	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	339	188	55.5
Hispanic	504	277	55.0
White, non-Hispanic	13644	10395	76.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1938	693	35.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	290	89	30.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3370	1937	57.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	7691	5449	70.8
Female	7227	5750	79.6
Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used. The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!			

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	15085	9961	66.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	38	26	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	360	287	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	301	115	38.2
Hispanic	438	196	44.8
White, non-Hispanic	13892	9305	67.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2302	803	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	300	101	33.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3239	1528	47.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	7773	5235	67.4
Female	7310	4724	64.6
Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used. The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!			

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	15063	10861	72.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	25	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	349	283	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	300	160	53.3
Hispanic	429	212	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	13891	10139	73.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2304	723	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	261	86	33.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3222	1719	53.4
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	7762	5272	67.9
Female	7299	5587	76.5
Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used. The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!			

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	15292	10241	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	25	44.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	326	243	74.5
Black, non-Hispanic	317	127	40.1
Hispanic	433	190	43.9
White, non-Hispanic	14009	9555	68.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2482	803	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	242	67	27.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3204	1477	46.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	7923	5349	67.5
Female	7365	4889	66.4

Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used.

The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!

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	15276	10996	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	55	33	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	322	248	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	308	157	51.0
Hispanic	426	208	48.8
White, non-Hispanic	14014	10239	73.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2483	793	31.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	216	53	24.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3195	1664	52.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	7917	5448	68.8
Female	7355	5546	75.4

Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used.

The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!

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	15812	10637	67.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	67	34	50.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	327	267	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	294	121	41.2
Hispanic	437	186	42.6
White, non-Hispanic	14529	9924	68.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2663	780	29.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	211	41	19.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3315	1563	47.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	8164	5515	67.6
Female	7643	5118	67.0
Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used. The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!			

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	15789	11366	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	57	36	63.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	320	266	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	290	151	52.1
Hispanic	425	194	45.7
White, non-Hispanic	14527	10609	73.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2669	826	31.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	181	42	23.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3293	1687	51.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	8151	5551	68.1
Female	7632	5812	76.2
Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used. The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!			

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	16258	10029	61.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	133	79	59.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	288	216	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	267	103	38.6
Hispanic	502	176	35.1
White, non-Hispanic	14877	9328	62.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2647	577	21.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	198	29	14.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3157	1240	39.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	8389	5208	62.1
Female	7869	4821	61.3

Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used.

The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!

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	16244	10847	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	124	79	63.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	285	217	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	264	126	47.7
Hispanic	489	194	39.7
White, non-Hispanic	14882	10091	67.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2654	671	25.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	175	27	15.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3143	1372	43.7
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	8382	5242	62.5
Female	7862	5605	71.3

Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used.

The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!

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	16440	9424	57.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	20	34.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	253	179	70.8
Black, non-Hispanic	284	86	30.3
Hispanic	466	133	28.5
White, non-Hispanic	15232	8910	58.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2655	492	18.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	186	22	11.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3065	1009	32.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	8522	4855	57.0
Female	7916	4569	57.7

Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used.

The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!

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	16415	10795	65.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	62	30	48.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	249	184	73.9
Black, non-Hispanic	283	114	40.3
Hispanic	448	159	35.5
White, non-Hispanic	15230	10202	67.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2662	620	23.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	157	20	12.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3043	1271	41.8
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	8501	5045	59.4
Female	7912	5750	72.7

Comments: In populating EDEN combined data at each grade (meaning NECAP students and students who took the NH- Alternate Assessment) was used.

The "errors" that refer to changes that are more than 10% are directly related to the reason why percents shouldn't be used in small states with small subgroups! Our numbers are correct!

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: High school students were not tested in 2006-2007; 2006-2007 AYP Reports for high school students were based on graduation rate only. This transpired due to the transition to testing all 11th grade high school students with the new NECAP in the fall of 2007.			

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: High school students were not tested in 2006-2007; 2006-2007 AYP Reports for high school students were based on graduation rate only. This transpired due to the transition to testing all 11th grade high school students with the new NECAP in the fall of 2007.			

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	468	271	57.9
Districts	162	112	69.1
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 not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	231	110	47.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	35	11	31.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	196	99	50.5
Comments: #Title I schools made AYP in 06-07 - the difference in the numbers is due to pre-school or small school review.			

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
136	91	66.9
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.

Title I School Improvement funds were provided to Title I schools newly identified "In Need Of Improvement" for planning. Committees were organized to establish goals and develop an action plan. Once the plan is submitted implementation funds are available for schools to implement their plan.

Title I schools who were previously identified "In Need Of Improvement" complete a School Improvement Plan Progress Report and request for additional funding to help to continue the implementation of their plan.

Common areas in which many schools are focusing:

? align curriculum with Grade Level and Grade Span Expectations;

? data analysis;

? instructional models that incorporate research-based practices that have been proven to be effective in improving student achievement;

? professional development aligned with school improvement goals;

? external support and resources based on their effectiveness and alignment with the school improvement plan; and

? extended learning opportunities for students.

In the SY 2006-2007 there were 34 Title I Schools In Need of Improvement. The state is divided into 5 regions and each region has a Title I/School Improvement Consultant to provide support and technical assistance in the development implementation and monitoring of the improvement plans.

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	1
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments: For the SY 2006-2007 only 2 NH schools were in Corrective Action.	

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments: For the SY 2006-2007 no NH schools were in Restructuring.	

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.

In the SY 2006-2007 there were 20 Districts Identified for Improvement and 7 exited improvement status with the release of the 2006-2007 data. The remaining 13 Title I Districts who were previously identified "In Need Of Improvement" complete a District Improvement Plan Progress Report and request for additional funding ($20000) to help to continue the implementation of their plan.

In all cases districts are required by the Department to identify a district improvement coordinator to monitor the district improvement plan. Monthly meetings for district improvement coordinators are held to share best practices and connect districts with resources to support their work.

Common areas in which districts are focusing:

? curriculum alignment;

? data analysis;

? instructional models that incorporate research-based practices that have been proven to be effective in improving student achievement;

? professional development aligned with district improvement goals;

? external support and resourced based on their effectiveness and alignment with the district's improvement plan; and

? shared leadership structures.

For the SY 2007-2008 19 new districts were identified as Districts In Need of Improvement. A two phase district improvement planning process designed by the Title I and Accountability offices was implemented to support districts as they develop their improvement plans for the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years. Each district was eligible for funding to obtain services of a facilitator for the duration of the process and funds ($20000) to implement their improvement plan.

Phase I - Root Cause Analysis

District data teams participated in an eight-week series of structured activities to identify and prioritize the core issues or possible root causes of low student achievement. This course (both on-line and face-to-face) was designed and provided in cooperation with the New England Comprehensive Center as part of its technical assistance agreement with New Hampshire.

Phase II - Designing the Plan

This phase is divided into two parts. The first part consists of teams identifying research-based practices and strategies most likely to impact their needs. The second part involves finalizing the implementation plan for Title I review and approval. Once the plan is reviewed and approved implementation funds are available.

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: For the SY 2006-2007 no districts were in Corrective Action.	

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	9/26/07	11/14/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	8/26/07	8/26/07
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	14	5
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	11/14/07

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.

New Hampshire's 1003(a) 4% set-aside funds are earmarked for all Title I schools designated "In Need of Improvement." Once these schools have been supported remaining funds have been allocated to Districts' designated "In Need of Improvement." Thus far we have been able to support all Title I schools and districts designated "In Need of Improvement" without setting priorities or the use of a formula.

Title I School Improvement funds ($4000) are provided to schools newly identified "In Need of Improvement" to assist in developing a School Improvement Plan. As part of this School Improvement Plan Title I schools can apply for additional funds ($25000) to support the implementation of their improvement plan activities. Title I Schools previously identified "In Need of Improvement" complete a School Improvement Progress Report and can request additional funding ($25000) to help to continue the implementation of their improvement plan.

Funds are designed to support the plan and not just to expand or augment the existing Title I program unless such changes have been identified within the improvement plan. Schools are charged to identify those activities which have the greatest likelihood of improving the quality of the instruction for those students not meeting the State's academic standards.

Activities supported through these funds include:

â€¢ Providing ongoing professional development and its associated costs

â€¢ Supporting parent involvement

â€¢ Purchasing supplies and materials if they are closely associated/needed to support a staff development activity or changes in instructional programs and

â€¢ Providing expanded learning opportunities for students to reach high standards.

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	6
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	8
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	4407
Who applied to transfer	120
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	120

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	$ 70271
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	19
Comments: Districts did not offer choice because LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which the students are eligible for public school choice.	

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	17
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	2473
Who applied for supplemental educational services	357
Who received supplemental educational services	355
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	$ 0
Comments: Did not collect	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	35212	34765	98.7	447	1.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1702	1668	98.0	34	2.0
Low-poverty schools	3327	3319	99.8	8	0.2
All elementary schools	9653	9583	99.3	70	0.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	3771	3699	98.1	72	1.9
Low-poverty schools	9754	9637	98.8	117	1.2
All secondary schools	25559	25182	98.5	377	1.5
Comments:					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes that are self-contained are counted once. Departmentalized middle grades are counted by each class (once for each subject taught).

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 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	72.9
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	27.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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)	70.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	29.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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	34.7	11.8
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	26.6	11.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
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
0	Dual language	0	0.0	0.0
0	Two-way immersion	0	0.0	0.0
0	Transitional bilingual	0	0.0	0.0
0	Developmental bilingual	0	0.0	0.0
0	Heritage language	0	0.0	0.0
8	Sheltered English instruction			
0	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
10	Content-based ESL			
12	Pull-out ESL			
0	Other (explain)			
Comments:				

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

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	2740
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	1590
Bosnian	253
Portuguese	174
Vietnamese	140
Arabic	136

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Indonisian - 116 LEP Students Russian - 109 LEP Students Chinese - 108 LEP Students

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	3042
Not tested/State annual ELP	279
Subtotal	3321
LEP/One Data Point	744
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 unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

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

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	2536
Not tested/State annual ELP	240
Subtotal	2776
LEP/One Data Point	583
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	0.0	0	0.0	Y
No progress		0		
ELP attainment	0.0	0	0.0	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	0.0	0	0.0	Y
No progress		0		
ELP attainment	0.0	0	0.0	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 1.6.3.1.2 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 unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:

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

	#
Total MFLEP	588
MFLEP/AYP grades	344
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	1134
LEP HS/Non-AYP	484
LEP other grades	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 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	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
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.

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
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
330	258	588
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
535	292	54.6	243

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
535	320	59.8	215

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the 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
2041	1744	12

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	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.	114
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.	159
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	30

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	4	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	1	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	4	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	1	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	3	20
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	12	75
PD provided to principals	0	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	0	0
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	1	7
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	0	0
Total		102
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/06	08/01/06	30
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.

Possibly set earlier application deadline.

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	87.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	86.1
Hispanic	75.9
White, non-Hispanic	87.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	86.1
Female	89.2
Comments: Black, non-Hispanic - the percentage is consistent with the data and the enrollment counts have been verified.	

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	3.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	3.6
Female	2.7
Comments: Male - the data has been verified; the total dropout rate is down (177).	

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	160	160
LEAs with subgrants	2	2
Total	162	162
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	<N	15
K	129	45
1	158	53
2	171	66
3	147	53
4	121	53
5	102	35
6	103	40
7	101	32
8	114	36
9	84	19
10	60	19
11	57	33
12	78	45
Ungraded	<N	0
Total	1439	544
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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	235	81
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	902	400
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	21	<N
Hotels/Motels	70	25
Total	1228	
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)	15
K	45
1	53
2	66
3	53
4	53
5	35
6	40
7	32
8	36
9	19
10	19
11	33
12	45
Ungraded	0
Total	544
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	72
Migratory children/youth	<N
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	97
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	2
2. Expedited evaluations	0
3. Staff professional development and awareness	2
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
5. Transportation	2
6. Early childhood programs	0
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	1
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	2
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	2
12. Counseling	0
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	0
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	1
15. School supplies	2
16. Referral to other programs and services	2
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
18. Other (optional)	1
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	1
2. School Selection	1
3. Transportation	1
4. School records	1
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	1
7. Other Barriers	2
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	41	23
4	41	17
5	24	<N
6	33	<N
7	25	<N
8	26	<N
High School	0	0
Comments: High School - not tested		

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	37	17
4	40	<N
5	24	<N
6	33	<N
7	25	<N
8	26	<N
High School	0	0
Comments: High School - not tested		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	<N
K	0
1	0
2	<N
3	0
4	<N
5	<N
6	<N
7	<N
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	<N
Total	36
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.

NH saw a decrease in the Category 1 child count due partly because of the closure of a major employee - a large meat processing plant in February 2004 and also by limited staff. The only full-time staff person had a lengthy sick leave and the part-time staff position turned over and was vacant.

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

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	<N
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	<N
5	0
6	<N
7	<N
8	0
9	<N
10	0
11	<N
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	<N
Total	13
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.

NH saw a decrease in the Category 2 child count due partly because of the closure of a major employee - a large meat processing plant in February 2004 and also due to a limited staff. The only full-time staff person had a lengthy sick leave and the part-time staff position turned over and was vacant.

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

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New Hampshire used MIS 2000 to compile and generate its 2006-2007 category 1 and category 2 child counts. Information was verified and/or updated using a manual system. Last year's child counts were also generated using the MIS 2000 system and verified with a manual count.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

*A standard state COE is completed during a home visit and all COEs are kept at the state office. Data from the COEs are entered into MIS 2000. Student lists are generated by the MIS 2000 and are maintained by the MEP staff. Reports from part-time staff are collected periodically during the school year. Similarly the data for the category 2 count was collected from the part-time staff and the one full-time MEP staff person. The MEP staff document their contacts with families and students on time record sheets and/or end of term reports.

*The NHMEP functions both as an SEA and an LEA. All records are maintained at the state office where the full-time MEP staff person is based. The full-time MEP staff person is responsible for completing the COEs. Contacts with families including recruiting tutoring and provision of other services are documented on time record sheets and/or reporting forms. These are collected by the SEA. The full-time staff person supervises the entry of this data summarizes the information and completes the reporting to OME.

*COEs are collected and stored at the state office. Reports from other part-time staff are collected periodically during the school year and at the end of the summer.

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.

The full-time MEP staff person either enters the data into MIS 2000 or supervises a support person when she enters the data. When we are notified of a change in the COE information a note is attached to the COE and the information in the database is updated. MIS 2000 reports are run periodically from the system and then a manual check is conducted.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable

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

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

*Each child count was calculated using both the MIS 2000 system and a manual check. Reports are run from the MIS 2000 system which are created to sort by QAD and include date of birth. These reports are then checked against the COE information to verify accuracy and insure that only children between the ages of three through 21 are counted and to verify whether two year olds have turned three during the relevant time period. The full-time MEP staff person regularly checks QAD and age information as she conducts program planning during the school year and summer.

*New Hampshire MEP staff conduct home visits or make telephone contact with the school or family at least once during the relevant time period for each child and/or family included in the count.

*New Hampshire has a small number of children enrolled in the program in the course of the year. Alphabetized student lists are generated by MIS2000. In the rare case where two students have the same name we check COEs DOB and parent information to verify that they are two different students.

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.

*For the category 2 count the NHMEP includes any child who received any MEP funded summer service whether it is an instructional or a support service. As the full time MEP staff person conducts summer planning she reviews QAD information and student ages. From this information she creates a list of those students eligible for summer services and the type of services that will be offered. Part-time tutors and family service providers submit reports at the end of the summer term to the SEA listing the type of service provided. These are given an "S" coding for summer and then manually rechecked. The MEP staff does not include migrant children who received only non-MEP funded summer services in the category 2 count. Neither does the program include any migrant child who resided in the state but did not receive MEP summer services. Children whose eligibility ended during the regular school year were included in the category 1 count and were not included in category 2 count. Children whose eligibility ended during the summer term were included in the summer count only if they received MEP funded services.

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.

*Verification of the eligibility data is the responsibility of the full-time MEP staff person. She has 23 years of experience in recruiting and has attended many training sessions provided by OME or other states. If after review she still is uncertain about a child's eligibility she contacts recruiting staff from other states.

*All records are maintained at the SEA. The full-time MEP staff person either enters the data or supervises the support staff person who does so. COE data are inputted approximately once a month. When we are notified that a family has moved changed telephone numbers etc. a note is attached to the COE and updates are entered into the system. Reports are run by the MIS 2000 system as described above and independently crosschecked by the full-time MEP staff person.

*Extensive efforts are made to verify the accuracy of information submitted to ED. The full-time staff person manually compares COE information and reports submitted from part-time staff with student lists that MIS2000 generates. If no MEP program staff has had direct contact with the eligible family we do not include the student(s) in question in the category 1 count. As stated in collection methods only eligible students who received an MEP funded service during the summer term are included in the category 2 count.

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.

All COE's were reviewed by a different person than the one who had filled out the COE originally. All were found eligible. The ConQIR process of re-interviewing was used on five families in their homes to verify accuracy. All were eligible.

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.

It is explained in the quality control process above. The only full-time staff person is responsible for recruiting and submitting data.

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.

It is explained in the quality control process above. There is only one full-time staff person and she is responsible for all of the steps including verifying the migrant portion of this report.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NH Migrant Program will be utilizing products created by the ConQir consortium to continue to ensure the accuracy of the MEP eligibility determinations.

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

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

In the space below, 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.

Not applicable

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

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