

**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

NEVADA



**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
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Nevada Department of Education		
Address: 700 E. 5th Street Carson City, NV 89701		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Kathy St. Clair		
Telephone: (775) 687-9185		
Fax: (775) 687-9120		
e-mail: kstclair@doe.nv.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Kathy St. Clair		
		<u>Friday, December 28, 2007, 11:41:14 AM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

1.1.1

The Nevada State Board of Education adopted challenging and rigorous standards that meet the requirements of NCLB in 1998-99. School districts in the state implemented these standards during the 1999-2000 school year.

In compliance with state statutes Nevada has completed a process of review and revision of the content standards and achievement indicators over the past three years. The science standards were revised during 2004-2005 the content standards in mathematics were revised in 2005-2006 and the revision of the standards in English Language Arts (ELA) was recently completed. The final adoption of the revised ELA standards will take place at the State Board of Education meeting scheduled for November 30 2007. For each of the content areas the school districts were expected to have implemented them fully by the beginning of the school year following adoption by the State Board of Education (i.e. the science standards were finally approved in the fall of 2005 and implemented in schools at the beginning of the 2006-2007 school year).

To facilitate the uniform implementation of the standards across the school districts in Nevada NDE has conducted two series of four regional workshops to introduce the new standards and achievement indicators to teachers administrators and regional trainers. The workshops were organized in each of the four major population regions in the state and participants were presented with materials to aid them in the communication of the organization content and goals of the standards and achievement indicators. Participants were also provided materials to help them in their charge to disseminate the messages of the workshop to teachers in schools across the state.

In addition to the preceding work with standards a program will be started in January 2008 to increase the depth of alignment of cognitive complexity of the test items. Based upon the Norm Webb model this program will increase the parallel alignment of both content and cognitive complexity.

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.

1.1.2

The information provided below illustrates the tests used by Nevada to comply with NCLB standards and assessment requirements. As of the 2005-06 school year all required assessments had been implemented with the exception of the science assessment. The high school science assessment will be implemented during the 2007-2008 school year.

For those students with significant cognitive disabilities Nevada is selecting a content standard that will be assessed along with the assessment of science inquiry skills. In addition Nevada is working with the University of Las Vegas Center for Assessment to establish a procedure and timelines for completing a new standard setting for the NASAA examinations.

Implementation of Nevada Assessments by Grade Subject Year of Implementation

3rd Reading 2001-02

3rd Math 2001-02

4th Reading 2005-06

4th Math 2005-06

5th Reading 2001-02

5th Writing 2005-06a

5th Math 2001-02

5th Science 2003-04

6th Reading 2005-06

6th Math 2005-06

7th Reading 2005-06

7th Math 2005-06

8th Reading 2003-04

8th Writing Pre-2000

8th Math 2003-04

8th Science 2003-04

HS Reading Pre-2000

HS Writing Pre-2000

HS Math Pre-2000

HS Science 2007-08

Prior to the 2005-2006 school year a writing test had been administered in grade 4 since the 1998-1999 school year.

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.

1.1.3

Achievement standards (indicators) in math and reading/language arts have been completed. The final version of the achievement indicators for math and reading/language arts were completed in September 2007 and presented to Nevada school districts in October 2007 in a series of four regional workshops held in Reno Carson City Las Vegas and Elko. The achievement indicator documents are currently being prepared and formatted for posting to the Nevada Department of Education website. NDE's expectation is that the targets established by the achievement indicators will be implemented in the school districts during the 2007-08 school year.

The NDE is currently (fall 2007) working to revise the existing achievement standards in math and reading /ELA for students with significant cognitive disabilities. We intend to complete the revision during the 2007-08 school year and have the changes fully implemented for 2008-09. The Nevada Alternate Scales of Academic Achievement (NASAA) is currently undergoing revision.

NASAA Timeline

ELA and Math Benchmarks for NASAA were completed November 6 2007.

Performance Level Descriptors to accompany the newly developed benchmark skills will be developed on December 6 and 7 2007.

An alignment study will be conducted on February 7 and 8 2008.

In March the cut scores for the 2007-2008 NASAA administration will be established.

An instructional guide to accompany the benchmark skills for ELA and math is being developed. The Training Manual and Scoring Guide are being revised to reflect the changes for the 2008-2009 school year. Training of the NASAA trainers is anticipated to begin in mid-May 2008.

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.

1.1.4

The Nevada Department of Education has been testing all students in science at grades 5 and 8 since 2004-05. In preparation for full implementation of a science test at the high school level the department started a new series of field tests of items for the High School science test in the spring of 2006. These field tests included all students in grade 10 in all Nevada high schools. A second set of field tests were administered in the spring of 2007 again to all students in grade 10 across the state. Data from these field tests were used to select items to populate the test form that all 10th grade students will take as part of the Nevada High School Proficiency Examination in the spring of 2008. Beginning with all students in 10th grade in 2007-08 achievement of a passing score on the science test will become part of the state requirements for graduation. As the test administered in the spring of 2008 will be the first live administration of the HSPE science test NDE will conduct a standard setting meeting in May 2008 to establish the cut score required for passing the science test.

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.

1.1.5

Achievement standards (indicators) in science have been completed. The final versions of the achievement indicators for science were completed in August 2007 and presented to Nevada school districts in October 2007 in series of four regional workshops held in Reno Carson City Las Vegas and Elko. The achievement indicator documents are currently being prepared and formatted for posting to the NDE website. The expectation of NDE is that the targets established by the achievement indicators will be implemented in the school districts during the 2007-08 school year.

The NDE is currently (fall 2007) working to revise the existing achievement standards in science for students with significant cognitive disabilities. We intend to complete the revision during the 2007-08 school year and have the changes fully implemented for 2008-09.

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	223851	221680	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3542	3494	98.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	17579	17470	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	24819	24475	98.6
Hispanic	78995	78285	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	98421	97597	99.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23134	22615	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32922	32660	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	86429	85597	99.0
Migratory students	52	52	100.0
Male	114183	113025	99.0
Female	109544	108655	99.2
Comments:			

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		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21051	93.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1564	6.9
Total	22615	
Comments: Please note that because so many staff are off because of the holiday break, I was not able to break down the numbers of students with disabilities who participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations. This information is available, but not accessible until after January 2, 2008.		

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	223851	221676	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3542	3500	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	17579	17471	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	24819	24468	98.6
Hispanic	78995	78272	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	98421	97606	99.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23134	22600	97.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32922	32634	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	86429	85587	99.0
Migratory students	52	52	100.0
Male	114183	112972	98.9
Female	109544	108704	99.2
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21036	93.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1564	6.9
Total	22600	
Comments: Please note that because so many staff are off because of the holiday break, I was not able to break down the numbers of students with disabilities who participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations. This information is available, but not accessible until after January 2, 2008.		

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	33315	18561	55.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	511	243	47.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2515	1750	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3575	1398	39.1
Hispanic	12950	6008	46.4
White, non-Hispanic	13698	9141	66.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3487	1082	31.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8247	3280	39.8
Economically disadvantaged students	14857	6753	45.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	17002	9566	56.3
Female	16304	8994	55.2
Comments: The data are correct as reported			

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	33309	19745	59.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	514	277	53.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2514	1818	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3575	1660	46.4
Hispanic	12945	6081	47.0
White, non-Hispanic	13696	9883	72.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3476	1019	29.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8240	2964	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	14853	6849	46.1
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	16990	9358	55.1
Female	16310	10384	63.7
Comments: The data are correct as reported			

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	32707	21040	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	524	299	57.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2632	2058	78.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3586	1718	47.9
Hispanic	12159	6659	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	13715	10265	74.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3572	1243	34.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6651	2801	42.1
Economically disadvantaged students	14325	7693	53.7
Migratory students	12	<N	
Male	16770	10666	63.6
Female	15909	10361	65.1

Comments: The data are correct as reported.

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	32704	18901	57.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	524	276	52.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2629	1834	69.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3585	1594	44.5
Hispanic	12156	5371	44.2
White, non-Hispanic	13718	9787	71.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3568	877	24.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6646	1655	24.9
Economically disadvantaged students	14325	6283	43.9
Migratory students	12	<N	
Male	16766	8843	52.7
Female	15909	10048	63.2

Comments: The data are correct as reported.

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	32963	19261	58.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	536	264	49.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2527	1842	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3589	1439	40.1
Hispanic	12063	5805	48.1
White, non-Hispanic	14169	9884	69.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3566	837	23.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5082	1398	27.5
Economically disadvantaged students	14178	6600	46.6
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	16879	9683	57.4
Female	16070	9573	59.6

Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System

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	32965	16979	51.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	535	259	48.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2525	1554	61.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3590	1348	37.5
Hispanic	12066	4490	37.2
White, non-Hispanic	14169	9298	65.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3556	594	16.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5084	613	12.1
Economically disadvantaged students	14178	5303	37.4
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	16878	7997	47.4
Female	16072	8978	55.9

Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System

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	33668	20167	59.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	545	304	55.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2692	2020	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3756	1509	40.2
Hispanic	12068	5738	47.5
White, non-Hispanic	14534	10566	72.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6466	3663	56.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10609	7172	67.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18563	11388	61.3
Migratory students	1374	1369	99.6
Male	15583	8439	54.2
Female	16825	10481	62.3
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	33627	19139	56.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	544	320	58.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2692	1860	69.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3756	1436	38.2
Hispanic	12054	5249	43.5
White, non-Hispanic	14507	10246	70.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3431	556	16.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4342	578	13.3
Economically disadvantaged students	13543	5829	43.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	17013	8766	51.5
Female	16593	10364	62.5
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	33099	19220	58.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	507	280	55.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2457	1885	76.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3774	1543	40.9
Hispanic	11801	5279	44.7
White, non-Hispanic	14477	10213	70.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3337	564	16.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3736	758	20.3
Economically disadvantaged students	12574	5628	44.8
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	16988	9409	55.4
Female	16090	9805	60.9
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	33062	21325	64.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	507	331	65.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2460	1930	78.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3767	1923	51.0
Hispanic	11787	6092	51.7
White, non-Hispanic	14461	11016	76.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3326	714	21.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3728	752	20.2
Economically disadvantaged students	12565	6530	52.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	16961	9866	58.2
Female	16081	11452	71.2
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	33000	17417	52.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	528	247	46.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2557	1807	70.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3791	1245	32.8
Hispanic	11287	4248	37.6
White, non-Hispanic	14764	9857	66.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3178	393	12.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3199	422	13.2
Economically disadvantaged students	11722	4517	38.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	16938	8844	52.2
Female	16046	8570	53.4
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	32995	18760	56.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	527	280	53.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2555	1756	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3792	1558	41.1
Hispanic	11294	4677	41.4
White, non-Hispanic	14749	10464	70.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3176	414	13.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3209	280	8.7
Economically disadvantaged students	11730	4986	42.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	16942	8676	51.2
Female	16036	10080	62.9
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	22944	14689	64.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	341	206	60.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2090	1565	74.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2388	955	40.0
Hispanic	5909	2880	48.7
White, non-Hispanic	12216	9083	74.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1980	329	16.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1363	307	22.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4331	2010	46.4
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	11349	7702	67.9
Female	11595	6987	60.3
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	23001	20902	90.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	346	312	90.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2091	1951	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2379	1983	83.4
Hispanic	5932	5002	84.3
White, non-Hispanic	12253	11654	95.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1984	1002	50.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1363	684	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4344	3563	82.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	11341	10185	89.8
Female	11660	10717	91.9
Comments: The above information is confirmed by our Student Information System			

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	572	385	67.3
Districts	18	17	94.4
Comments: The information in this chart is incorrect: There are 17 districts in Nevada and 16 of them made AYP (94.1%)			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			
Comments: The SEA submitted the N/X 103 for data group 32 and N/X 101 for data group 22. N/X 101 file has been submitted as missing for asking data categories which is the reason that data cannot show up in the auto calculated section.			
The correct information for this table is as follows:			
All Title I Schools: 141; 93 made AYP (65.9%)			
Schoolwide Title I Schools: 129; 92 made AYP (71.3%)			
Targeted ASsistance Title I Schools: 12; 11 made AYP (91.6%)			

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

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
17	16	94.1
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.

Each Title I school that is identified in the attached chart (The chart submitted in response to question 1.4.4.1) has been required to revise its school improvement plan in accordance with the requirements of *NCLB*, and each plan is then peer reviewed at the district level to make certain it is compliant with all the requirements of section 1116 of *NCLB* in terms of what the revised school improvement plan must contain. The district also determines if the plan will, in the LEA's opinion, contribute to the academic growth of the children who attend that school.

In order to help the schools make meaningful revisions of their school improvement plans, the Nevada Department of Education has mandated that each school must spend a portion of its school improvement funds for planning purposes. With these planning dollars, each school is required to engage the services of an approved external facilitator who has experience in working with schools identified as in need of improvement.

Each external facilitator works with the school throughout the 90 day window during which the school must revise its plan. The external facilitators use a school improvement process which has been developed by NDE called SAGE (Student Achievement Gap Elimination). The SAGE procedure takes the school through a four-part planning process which includes a comprehensive needs assessment, an inquiry process, the design of a master plan, and the development of an implementation and evaluation timeline for putting the plan into action. When the school completes the SAGE process, with the external facilitator's assistance, the NDE provides the bulk of the school improvement money to the school so that it may begin implementing its newly revised school improvement plan.

By requiring school to engage the services of an external facilitator during the planning phase, NDE has seen a dramatic increase in the quality of the school improvement plans. In turn, NDE will be conducting an evaluation study of SAGE to determine the impact that participating in the SAGE process has on the school who engaged in the process and on the academic achievement of the students who attend these schools. Preliminary evaluation data shows that several of the schools who engaged in the SAGE process actually made AYP during the 2005-2006 school year or even if the school did not make AYP, made dramatic achievement gains in many of the subpopulations present at these schools.

Based on the 2005-2006 AYP data, NDE identified 29 Title I schools that were in the 3rd year of improvement or beyond during the 2005-2006 school year. Building on the external facilitator model, these schools were assigned an entire school support team consisting of 5 team members whose roles are identified in state statute. These teams worked intensively with each of the 29 schools, and were in fact so successful that 19 of the schools actually made AYP for the 2006-2007 school year. These teams assist with the revision of the school improvement plan, but then remain active at the school for the remainder of the school year, filing monthly reports with NDE regarding the status of the implementation of the action steps of the school's improvement plan.

Of these 29 schools mentioned above, 9 were in year four (Planning for Restructuring). All of these schools were required to engage in the year-long planning for restructuring process described in *NCLB*. Of these 9 schools, 4 actually had to move on to the implementation of their restructuring plan for the 2007-2008 school year. All restructuring plans had to be submitted to and approved by the SEA.

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	29
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

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

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

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

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- 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.

Based on data from the 2005-2006 school year, the Clark County School District was identified as being in Year Three of Improvement (Corrective Action) for the 2006-2007 school year. The option chosen by the SEA was the implementation of a new curriculum. The district was required to evaluate the alignment of its existing curriculum with state standards and based on the outcome of that evaluate, to make changes to their curriculum which would bring it more closely into alignment with the state standards. During the winter and spring of 2006-2007, CCSD did a self-evaluation of its curriculum, using a tool developed by the Nevada Department of Education called the NCCAT (Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Audit Tool). In May of 2007, a team of nine educators consisting of membership from both within and external to the SEA visited CCSD to view the evidence assembled by the district. Based on this review, a report was written specifying actions the district would need to take to more fully align its curriculum to state standards. Then CCSD would be required to design a plan to implement this more fully aligned curriculum. The review is still on-going, and in the winter of 2008, another team will visit the district to determine if CCSD is implementing the more fully aligned curriculum. NDE considers this an on-going process that will more than likely take several years to accomplish fully, given the size of the district (over 300,000 students).

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	1
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	8/1/07	8/1/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	6/15/07	6/15/07
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	6	6
Schools	141	92
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	8/1/07
---	--------

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.

Priorities SEA used in allocating funds to schools:

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) has four priorities when awarding funds from Section 1003(a). The first priority is given to Title I schools identified as being in the First Year of In Need Of Improvement (INOI). First Year INOI Title I schools received funding at the beginning of the 2006-2007 school year to assist in the revision of the school's improvement plan (SIP); such revision was required to be based on data analysis from the previous and current academic years. Upon submission of the peer-reviewed and LEA-approved SIP to NDE additional awards were made to support implementation of the SIP.

The second priority is to pay for School Support Team Leaders (SSTLs) assigned by NDE to work with Title I schools in corrective action planning for restructuring or restructuring. The SSTLs in conjunction with the rest of the School Support Team assist in data analysis and focused goal development during revision of the school's improvement plan; the SSTL is then responsible to monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan including at least monthly visits to the school for the remainder of the school year. These site visits are comprehensive in nature and require ongoing analysis of data compiled by the school to monitor student academic progress.

The third priority is to provide funding to schools that are in First Year-Hold INOI and beyond to support implementation of their peer-reviewed and LEA-approved school improvement plans. Funding proposals are analyzed by NDE to ensure that expenditures are linked to the school's improvement plan.

The fourth priority is for LEAs to receive funds to support District Initiatives; such initiatives allow LEAs to provide technical assistance or professional development to one or more of the LEA's Title I schools in various levels of INOI.

SEA's methods for distributing funds:

All section 1003(a) funding awarded during 2006-2007 under priorities one and two above was done on a formula basis. First Year INOI Title I schools receive \$15000 initially to assist in the revision of the school's improvement plan and received an additional award to assist in the implementation of these SIPs; these awards ranged from \$40000 to \$50000 with the variable amount based on a student factor. Awards of \$20000 each were made to Title I schools in corrective action planning for restructuring or restructuring to pay for the School Support Team Leaders assigned by NDE to monitor the implementation of the school's improvement plan.

For the third priority awards made to assist in the implementation of a SIP at Title I schools identified at First Year-Hold INOI and beyond were based on a student factor formula during the 2006-2007 school year with one exception. Funding to schools in Clark CSD that were in First Year-Hold INOI and beyond to support implementation of their SIPs was adjusted in a joint decision made by the LEA and NDE to accommodate the fact that all such schools had significant amounts remaining from similar awards made during the 2005-2006 school year.

Funding under the fourth priority District Initiatives was awarded during 2006-2007 based on the number of Title I schools that the district had identified in being in various stages of INOI and varied between \$80000 for LEAs with four such schools to \$772000 for an LEA with 40 such schools.

Types of activities supported by funds:

As indicated earlier all Section 1003(a) funding awarded under priorities one and three must be aligned to goals objectives and action steps in the corresponding SIP; for priority four such alignment must be evident in the LEA's improvement plan. Priority one Title I schools identified as being in the First Year INOI used their \$15000 planning award for hiring external facilitators to assist in the data analysis and inquiry process as well as for paying stipends for instructional staff to participate in the planning process outside of their contracted time. Any funding remaining once the planning process was complete could be added to the implementation funds that the school received. The types of activities supported by implementation funding under both priorities one and three included professional development as well as specific activities to target struggling students such as additional staff to provide interventions tutoring before school or during intersessions and supplemental instructional programs.

Section 1003(a) funding awarded under priority two payment of School Support Team Leaders at Title I schools in corrective action

planning for restructuring or restructuring provided support to such schools in two ways. First through assistance in data analysis and focused goal development during revision of the school's improvement plan and second through monitoring the implementation of the SIP including at least monthly visits to the school for the remainder of the school year. These site visits are comprehensive in nature and require ongoing analysis of data compiled by the school to monitor student academic progress.

Section 1003(a) funding awarded for the 2006-2007 school year under priority four District Initiatives varied between the four districts involved. One district provided additional professional development to teachers at the LEA's Title I schools INOI to support implementation of the district's recently adopted standards-based reading curriculum. Another district developed a partnership with a state university to work with the staff at the LEA's only Title I middle school identified as in Second Year INOI on curriculum mapping. Another district provided comprehensive assistance with data analysis to all of its Title I schools INOI.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

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

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	62
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	122
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	44469
Who applied to transfer	1225
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	1061

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
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	\$ 1382636
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	2
Comments:	

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

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

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	46
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	30988
Who applied for supplemental educational services	7831
Who received supplemental educational services	5993
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	\$ 712482
Comments:	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught 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	49620	42978	86.6	6642	13.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	3323	2859	86.0	464	14.0
Low-poverty schools	3001	2799	93.3	202	6.7
All elementary schools	12821	11542	90.0	1279	10.0
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	6041	4830	80.0	1211	20.0
Low-poverty schools	1735	1519	87.6	216	12.4
All secondary schools	36799	31436	85.4	5363	14.6
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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Currently Nevada is doing head count. If a teacher is less than full time or full time, they are counted as 1. For example: if the full time equivalency is 50% or 1/2 time, we count them as 1. If the full time equivalency is 1.00, we also count them as 1 in all figures submitted for elementary.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	69.7
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	30.3
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)	0.6
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	60.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	38.6
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	68.7	23.9
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch rate	
Secondary schools	48.2	18.8
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch rate	
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
1	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
1	Two-way immersion	Spanish	50.0	50.0
0	Transitional bilingual	None	0.0	0.0
1	Developmental bilingual	Spanish	60.0	40.0
0	Heritage language	None	0.0	0.0
14	Sheltered English instruction			
0	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
17	Content-based ESL			
14	Pull-out ESL			
4	Other (explain)			
Comments: Push-In				

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.	127098
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	104679
Tagalog	3738
Filipino	1554
Chinese	1351
Vietnamese	904

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	75282
Not tested/State annual ELP	312
Subtotal	75600
LEP/One Data Point	18370
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	75282
Not tested/State annual ELP	309
Subtotal	75591
LEP/One Data Point	18368
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.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
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	50.0	30946	54.4	Y
No progress		24456		
ELP attainment	14.0	8584	15.5	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	50.0	30946	54.4	Y
No progress		24456		
ELP attainment	14.0	8584	15.5	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	<u>Yes</u>
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	75684
MFLEP/AYP grades	75684
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	31038
LEP HS/Non-AYP	5611
LEP other grades	38633
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the 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
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
23094		23094
Comments: We do not have the number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored this year but we will have the numbers next year.		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
23094	13602	58.9	

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
23094	14924	64.6	

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	9
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	6
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	8
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	7
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	8
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	7
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	9
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	8
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	5
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 <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

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

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

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
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
14742	14742	6

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	990
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	926
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	271

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	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	2	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	9	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	8	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	4528
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	8	514
PD provided to principals	7	599
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	4	339
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	406
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	4	153
Total		6539
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
6/29/07	7/05/07	6
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.

Time constraint for districts to receive Title III funds is primarily dependent on the districts submitting their budgets and requests for funds (both via on-line computer network). Most requests are approved within three working days.

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

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
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	67.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	76.8
Black, non-Hispanic	52.7
Hispanic	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	75.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	64.6
Female	70.4
Comments: Data for children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>), Limited English Proficient, Economically disadvantaged, and migratory students not available.	

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	4.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	6.5
White, non-Hispanic	3.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	5.0
Female	4.2
Comments: Data not available for children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>), Limited English proficient, economically disadvantaged, or migratory students.	

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	14	14
LEAs with subgrants	3	3
Total	17	17
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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	47
K	16	510
1	17	525
2	12	517
3	13	477
4	18	420
5	13	441
6	14	457
7	11	392
8	12	386
9	10	414
10	14	271
11	15	146
12	13	158
Ungraded	0	35
Total	178	5196
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	<N	641
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	118	3053
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	12	66
Hotels/Motels	42	1436
Total		5196
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)	47
K	199
1	242
2	232
3	199
4	163
5	215
6	203
7	177
8	160
9	195
10	126
11	60
12	76
Ungraded	35
Total	2329

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	203
Migratory children/youth	<N
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	811
Limit English proficient students	395

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	3
2. Expedited evaluations	2
3. Staff professional development and awareness	2
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
5. Transportation	3
6. Early childhood programs	2
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	2
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	2
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
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)	
20. Other (optional)	
Comments: Under 18 (Other), one LEA offers college scholarships to Homeless Youth.	

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	2
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	1
7. Other Barriers	0
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	379	138
4	340	143
5	353	122
6	347	136
7	303	139
8	283	107
High School	350	235
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	377	119
4	338	171
5	352	129
6	344	123
7	301	108
8	278	92
High School	334	119
Comments:		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the 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)	70
K	<N
1	20
2	20
3	14
4	12
5	21
6	18
7	17
8	13
9	13
10	<N
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	<N
Total	252
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.

Not applicable

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)	11
K	<N
1	<N
2	<N
3	<N
4	<N
5	0
6	0
7	<N
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	27
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count for 2006 was 19 students, and the Category 2 count for 2007 was 27 students. Although this increase is greater than 10 percent, the actual numbers are so small that the increase is not that significant. The increase occurred because more districts were encouraged to have migrant students participate in the summer school programs sponsored by the individual districts.

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.

Nevada has used the MIS 2000 program for a number of years to generate the Category 1 child count. The Category 2 child count is also generated using a specially designed component of the MIS 2000 system. All districts providing summer school services submit a report that identifies each participant by name, age, birth date and mother's last name. The information is inputted into the program that identifies any duplication of participants.

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.

Category 1 Child Counts: Each year new COEs are generated by each of the districts participating in or wanting to participate in the Migrant Education Program. Using face-to-face interviews, each of the local recruiters completes a new COE for all migrant youth. Data collected on each COE form includes the following: father's name, mother's name, male guardian's name, female guardian's name, address, and racial/ethnic group.

Information collected for each child in the household ages 3-21 includes the following: name, sex, birth date, place of birth, school name, grade in school, participation in special education programs, and status of immunizations.

Additional information collected on each COE includes the following: qualifying activity, residency date, termination/withdrawal date, type of employment generating the move (seasonal, agriculture, fishing, etc.), status of eligibility (identifies years classified as migrant), date of move qualifying the student as a migratory student, name of individual supplying information, signature of recruiter, signature of parent or guardian, and date.

The identified recruiter in each district has the responsibility for completing the COE for each child. The recruiters are encouraged to complete the COE immediately upon the identification of the migrant child, and thus COEs are completed at any time during the year. All COEs must be submitted to the data collection center by September 15 of each year. The district retains a copy of the COE and the original COE is sent to the data collection center, located in the Churchill County School District. After all COEs are received by the data collection center, the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews and approves each COE. The COE form includes a space where the Director initials the COE to indicate approval. Those COEs not acceptable and those needing corrections or additional information are returned to the local district.

The form used to submit data for the Category 2 list of migrant youth participating in summer school programs is transmitted to each district in June. Each district is required to submit the list that includes name, age, grade and identifying information to the data collection center by September 15 of each year. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews and approves data submitted to the data collection center prior to the information being finalized and reports generated.

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.

One person, located in Churchill County School District, enters the data from all COEs generated statewide into the computer system. The data input person reviews the data entered into the computer and then the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews each COE for accuracy and completeness. Any COE that the data input operator or the Migrant Education Director questions is returned to the district recruiter for completion or for verification of accuracy.

The MIS 2000 program has a special menu that allows the data input person to develop a "Suspected Duplicate" list. Based on the traits identified by the operator, the list can be developed based on a large number of factors. In most instances, the Nevada operator has the computer program cross-reference the combination of the student names and birth dates of all youth entered into the system for duplications. If duplication is identified on that list, it is further analyzed based on mother's name to determine if a record is duplicated. The computer program highlights names it has classified as duplicates, and the data entry clerk reviews this list. After any instances of duplication are resolved, the statewide data input person generates a statewide list as well as a unique list for each district at the end of the year. The fact that Nevada has a single data entry operator and data entry site, dramatically decreases the number of duplicate entries. States with multiple data entry locations have a much larger duplicate count because intrastate moves of a child will result in the child be entered into the system multiple times with multiple identification numbers.

Nevada's process allows each district to review the list of students identified for the individual district for accuracy prior to submission to the SEA for review. After the district review, the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director (SEA)

approves the count numbers for each district as well as the statewide count information. Category 2 students are entered into a summer school component of the MIS 2000 system. The computer program analyzes the data for the Category 2 child count to reveal any duplication of names and to also verify that the individual child was included in the Category 1 child count.

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.

The same process was used for both the Category 1 count and the Category 2 count.

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

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1: The COE forms and the MIS 2000 program are designed to capture the following information: 1) That the child is between the ages of 3-21; 2) That the child had not graduated from high school; 3) That the date was within 36 months of the QAD; and 4) That the child has had his/her 3rd birthday before August 31, 2006 and was still resident after the birthday occurred.

The MIS 2000 program is designed to determine each student's eligibility and the operator highlights for review any file not meeting the program's criteria. In addition, all COEs are reviewed for accuracy and eligibility by the local coordinator, the data input operator and the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director. The review by the SEA is verified by the initials of the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director on each of the COE forms. The SEA reviews all COEs for accuracy and completeness prior to their entry into the computer system, and the computer program determines duplication.

The Migrant summer school program count is reported at the end of the summer school session by each participating district. The district completes an enrollment list that includes child identifying information and submits this list to the data collection center. The form used by each district to submit the data includes the name of the school, the dates of the summer school session and the signature of the local migrant education coordinator. The Nevada Department of Education maintains a list of the regular school year for each district in the state, and the SEA compares this list to the dates identified for summer school programs to determine the dates of the regular school and the summer school do not overlap. The data collection center operator verifies that each child identified on the list is a valid migrant education participant included in the Category 1 child count on the MIS 2000 program.

The summer enrollment list is designed to capture the following information: 1) That the child is between the ages of 3-21, 2) That the child had not graduated from high school, 3) That the date was within 36 months of the QAD, and 4) That the child has had his/her 3rd birthday before August 31, 2006 and was still resident after the birthday occurred

If the child is an appropriate participant, the data operator enters the child into a program that determines if the combination of the name and birth date of the individual child is an unduplicated combined name and birth date for the summer school program. If duplication is discovered, the program automatically checks for mother's name to determine if a record is duplicated. The computer program highlights names it has classified as duplicates, and the data entry clerk reviews this list. The program also verifies that the child is included in the Category 1 component of the system. The count for Category 2 includes students who have attended the summer school program sponsored totally, or in part, by Title I, Part C funds. The summer school student list is sent to both the SEA and the LEA for review and verification.

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.

The same process was used for both the Category 1 count and the Category 2 count.

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

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The local program coordinator reviews the data on the COE that is produced each year for each child. The data input person and the Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director also checks for accuracy and eligibility. When entered into the computer database the program cross references for duplications. This review process occurs with both the Category 1 and the Category 2 children.

Specific activities related to quality control includes the following:

1. Nevada has a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that is used statewide and all districts are required to use this form.
2. Although the information requested on the COE remains the same from year to year, each year the SEA changes the color of the COE form. This is a quick and easy way to verify that each COE submitted is a new COE for the identified time period.
3. Recently the COE form was revised to more closely replicate the legal declarations identified by OME. Ray Melecio, National Education Hotline, supported this revision. Nevada conducts an annual Recruiter Training Session to verify all recruiters were able to accurately complete this revised form.
4. Incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs are returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification. In addition, the central input personnel will keep a list of recruiters or districts that submit questionable COEs and the Migrant Education Director will personally visit these individuals and provide additional technical assistance.
5. All recruiters are required to determine student eligibility based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult. Such interviews are conducted prior to completion of the COE.
6. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director oversees and verifies the training of recruiters. Training includes information related to eligibility requirements (including the basic eligibility definition), principal means of livelihood, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, industrial surveys, etc. Intensive training is mandatory for all newly identified recruiters.
7. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director provides recruiters with written eligibility guidelines.
8. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director routinely reviews eligibility documentation as part of regular monitoring and program visits.
9. The Migrant Education Program has a policy of resolving minor discrepancies at the lowest level possible, but also has identified local and state-level processes for resolving eligibility questions.
10. The Migrant Education Director periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises procedures.
11. In addition, the Nevada Department of Education conducts ongoing professional development activities not only to district Migrant Directors and Recruiters, but also to related personnel. With the small population in the state, Nevada cross trains various individuals such as Title I Directors, Title III Directors and school secretaries in various issues related to the identification of eligible migrant students.
12. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director reviews student attendance at summer school projects through both site visits to the programs and a review of attendance lists.
13. The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director ensures the quality of interviewers' eligibility decisions by visiting programs, participating in informal meetings with program participants and the review of local records and documentation. In addition, local program providers are aware that they can contact the Migrant Education Program Director at any time if they feel the local program is not in compliance with state and federal requirements.

Prior to the start of the summer school sessions, all districts are provided written procedures on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data and copies of the required reporting materials.

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.

In order to test the accuracy of Nevada's MEP eligibility, every fifth child was in the pool to be re-interviewed. Since Nevada is a large geographic state, it is not the most effective use of the SEA's time to visit each program site for the re-interview process. The process used to initially screen out valid COEs was to telephone the principal of the school the child was attending and have the principal verify the status of the child. Since most of the migrant students in Nevada attend small, rural schools the principals know the family situation of the individual students. If the principal could name the employer of the parent or guardian and also verify the date the child enrolled in school, then the COE was considered valid. If the principal named an employer the SEA was not familiar with the SEA contacted the employer to verify that the work met MEP requirements. If the principal was not able to verify eligibility the family was contacted by telephone by a bilingual staff member of the SEA.

This process worked well in the rural areas and every principal the SEA contacted was able to provide the necessary information. Of the 44 students identified in rural areas, all of the principals were able to provide sufficient information to confirm eligibility.

However, in Reno the schools are much larger and the principals were not as knowledgeable of the personal histories of the students. Since the principals were not able to confirm the eligibility, the district director personally met with the six families and confirmed the eligibility.

Of the 50 migrant students identified for re-evaluation, all 50 were found to be eligible for migrant education services.

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.

In addition to items previously addressed, Nevada has nine (9) professional staff members of the Department of Education who are assigned responsibility for oversight of Title I, Part A; Title I, School Improvement; and Title III activities in specified school districts. During the school year, these Title I and Title III Consultants make periodic site visits to each of the districts to provide technical assistance and oversight of the Title I and Title III programs. These visits verify that students are receiving required services and assistance with specific emphasis on meeting the educational needs of the migrant and LEP students.

During the spring of each year, the assigned Title I Consultant conducts a formal monitor visit where a prescribed checklist is used to determine compliance with Title I, Part A requirements. One of the questions asked of principals and other site-specific staff is how the needs of the migrant students are being met through the Title I services. Those schools who are unable to provide an acceptable response to the question are identified in the formal report sent to the district and those schools are offered technical assistance in ways to meet the education needs of migrant students.

The Nevada Department of Education, Migrant Education Director also conducts periodic visits to all programs/districts receiving migrant education funds. Most visits are informal in nature and are designed to provide technical assistance and guidance to local personnel. However, during the spring of each year, a formal monitor visit is conducted where all programs respond to specific questions and are asked to provide specific documentation verifying appropriate activities and records. During this visit, the program's records are reviewed to determine if the information is in agreement with the data submitted on the COEs to the data collection center. The monitor visit includes interviews with local program providers, youth participants, and parents as well as district administrative personnel. The SEA thus determines if students are receiving the educational services needed, first by Title I, Part A and then by Title I, Part C.

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.

Nevada has adopted a system where only one person in the state enters the data into the computer system. When each district completes a COE on a new child, the district retains a copy of the COE and the original is sent to Churchill County School District where the data for the entire State is entered into the system. At the conclusion of the eligibility period, the data coordinator reviews all of the COEs for accuracy, completeness and to verify there is no duplication of students. A district list is sent to each district for review and comment. If there is a concern stated from any of the involved parties, the data input person, the State Migrant Education Director, and the district coordinator jointly review the identified records. After all district, input review and paper reviews are completed, the SEA does a final review of all COEs.

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.

Considering that Nevada currently has 100% accuracy, there is no reason to initiate additional controls at this time. If the current process shows problems in the future, then changes will be made.

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

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

In the space below, 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.

At this time, Nevada does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

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

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