

**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 2007-08

ALASKA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

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* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- 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 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) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

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.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

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 pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 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, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Alaska Department of Education & Early Development		
Address: PO Box 110500 Juneau, AK 99811-0500		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Margaret MacKinnon		
Telephone: 907-465-2970		
Fax: 907-465-2989		
e-mail: margaret.mackinnon@alaska.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Margaret MacKinnon		
		Thursday, March 26, 2009, 2:07:59 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

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. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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

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 and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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 as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities 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 assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below 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 and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In April 2008 the state administered the first operational form of the science assessment in grades 4, 8 and 10 with the Standard Based Assessments (SBA). The state also implemented an alternate assessment in science at the same grade levels during the spring of 2008. The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development met via audio conference on 11/19/2008 to review the science peer review notes with ED. Alaska is awaiting the final action items that may be addressed in a 12/2008 letter from USED.
--

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

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 participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *NCLB*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	77,238	75,572	97.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	17,895	17,374	97.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,492	5,412	98.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,727	2,661	97.6
Hispanic	4,491	4,419	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	41,714	40,908	98.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,175	10,060	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,329	9,069	97.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30,993	30,224	97.5
Migratory students	5,039	4,954	98.3
Male	39,706	38,843	97.8
Female	37,532	36,729	97.9
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, and subtotal 1. 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.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in 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 participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,928	19.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,593	75.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	539	5.4
Total	10,060	
Comments:		

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

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 Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	77,238	76,049	98.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	17,895	17,546	98.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,492	5,383	98.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2,727	2,678	98.2
Hispanic	4,491	4,405	98.1
White, non-Hispanic	41,714	41,189	98.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,175	10,140	99.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,329	9,081	97.3
Economically disadvantaged students	30,993	30,439	98.2
Migratory students	5,039	4,986	99.0
Male	39,706	39,083	98.4
Female	37,532	36,966	98.5
Comments:			

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

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 data 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,921	19.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,591	75.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	538	5.4
Total	10,050	
Comments: Alaska assesses in reading, writing, math and science. For AYP purposes only, reading and writing are combined to create a LA score. The numbers reported in 1.2.3 are based on the LA scores. To report count for accommodated/not accommodated we can only look at each assessment on its own. The numbers reported in 1.2.4 are based on the reading assessment. There were about 90 students who only took the writing assessment (making them part of the LA counts) who did not take the reading assessment. That accounts for the difference between the totals reported in 1.2.3 and 1.2.4.		

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	29,075	27,304	93.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,795	6,309	92.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,069	1,968	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,017	954	93.8
Hispanic	1,613	1,514	93.9
White, non-Hispanic	15,858	14,927	94.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,683	3,491	94.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,613	3,370	93.3
Economically disadvantaged students	11,273	10,546	93.6
Migratory students	1,854	1,756	94.7
Male	14,804	13,887	93.8
Female	14,271	13,417	94.0

Comments: This is the first year that the Science test was administered in AK. We anticipate the second administration to show stronger participation.

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation data 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	575	16.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,704	77.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	212	6.1
Total	3,491	

Comments:

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 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	9,520	7,379	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,201	1,338	60.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	685	506	73.9
Black, non-Hispanic	349	232	66.5
Hispanic	641	476	74.3
White, non-Hispanic	4,923	4,267	86.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,528	814	53.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,170	523	44.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,370	2,904	66.5
Migratory students	603	407	67.5
Male	4,943	3,782	76.5
Female	4,577	3,597	78.6

Comments: There was an increase in the number of Hispanic students reported between 2007 and 2008. Also note that the sum of the race/ethnicity category will not equal the total of All Students because AK reports multi-racial (Ct=721) in its total. Due to the change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the LEP student population for 2007-2008 was approximately 15% less than the population in 2006-2007.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.2.1 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	9,536	7,409	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,207	1,305	59.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	678	517	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	351	253	72.1
Hispanic	633	485	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,946	4,288	86.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,536	743	48.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,165	493	42.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,371	2,869	65.6
Migratory students	606	398	65.7
Male	4,957	3,621	73.0
Female	4,579	3,788	82.7

Comments: There was an increase in the number of Hispanic students reported between 2007 and 2008. Also note that the sum of the race/ethnicity category will not equal the total of All Students because AK reports multi-racial (Ct=721) in its total. Due to the change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the LEP student population for 2007-2008 was approximately 15% less than the population in 2006-2007.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: No science test at this grade level. It is only given at grades 4, 8, and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.2 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	9,227	6,849	74.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,217	1,236	55.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	645	474	73.5
Black, non-Hispanic	340	225	66.2
Hispanic	577	421	73.0
White, non-Hispanic	4,811	3,997	83.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,462	648	44.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,206	485	40.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,166	2,632	63.2
Migratory students	592	356	60.1
Male	4,703	3,451	73.4
Female	4,524	3,398	75.1

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year. Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 636). Due to the change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the LEP student population for 2007-2008 was approximately 15% less than the population in 2006-2007.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.2.2 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	9,249	7,292	78.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,230	1,303	58.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	637	503	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	339	254	74.9
Hispanic	574	462	80.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,827	4,241	87.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,466	713	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,199	492	41.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,173	2,823	67.6
Migratory students	593	367	61.9
Male	4,705	3,523	74.9
Female	4,544	3,769	82.9

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year. Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 642)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	8,977	4,214	46.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,160	461	21.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	636	209	32.9
Black, non-Hispanic	329	108	32.8
Hispanic	565	250	44.2
White, non-Hispanic	4,656	2,898	62.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,424	354	24.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,181	71	6.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,083	1,272	31.2
Migratory students	582	143	24.6
Male	4,402	2,027	46.0
Female	4,575	2,187	47.8
Comments: note that the sum of the race/ethnicity category will not equal the total of All Students because AK reports multi-racial (Ct=631) in its total.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 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	9,262	6,964	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,084	1,195	57.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	664	516	77.7
Black, non-Hispanic	332	215	64.8
Hispanic	527	380	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	4,992	4,169	83.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,340	593	44.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,020	398	39.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,911	2,486	63.6
Migratory students	621	404	65.1
Male	4,767	3,509	73.6
Female	4,495	3,455	76.9

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.
Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 672)
Due to the change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the LEP student population for 2007-2008 was approximately 15% less than the population in 2006-2007.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.2.3 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	9,279	7,281	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,087	1,206	57.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	657	513	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	333	239	71.8
Hispanic	524	397	75.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,012	4,407	87.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,346	608	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,009	352	34.9
Economically disadvantaged students	3,917	2,591	66.1
Migratory students	622	384	61.7
Male	4,779	3,512	73.5
Female	4,500	3,769	83.8

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.
Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 666)
Due to the change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the LEP student population for 2007-2008 was approximately 15% less than the population in 2006-2007.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: No science test at this grade level. It is only given at grades 4, 8, and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 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	9,285	6,881	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,141	1,199	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	656	504	76.8
Black, non-Hispanic	309	176	57.0
Hispanic	584	420	71.9
White, non-Hispanic	4,956	4,105	82.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,246	462	37.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,015	382	37.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3,789	2,375	62.7
Migratory students	639	375	58.7
Male	4,782	3,465	72.5
Female	4,503	3,416	75.9

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year and a decrease in Black students since last year. Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 639)
Due to the change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the LEP student population for 2007-2008 was approximately 15% less than the population in 2006-2007.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.2.4 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	9,295	7,151	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,150	1,170	54.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	645	480	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	308	207	67.2
Hispanic	578	451	78.0
White, non-Hispanic	4,974	4,335	87.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,249	457	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	997	271	27.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,793	2,424	63.9
Migratory students	641	368	57.4
Male	4,788	3,455	72.2
Female	4,507	3,696	82.0

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year and a decrease in Black students since last year. Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 640)
Due to the change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the LEP student population for 2007-2008 was approximately 15% less than the population in 2006-2007.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: No science test at this grade level. It is only given at grades 4, 8, and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.5 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	9,454	6,443	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,087	1,014	48.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	690	468	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	339	165	48.7
Hispanic	533	338	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	5,213	4,037	77.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,186	350	29.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,155	339	29.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,734	2,015	54.0
Migratory students	618	315	51.0
Male	4,861	3,199	65.8
Female	4,593	3,244	70.6

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.

Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 592)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.2.5 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	9,482	7,200	75.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,105	1,184	56.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	681	510	74.9
Black, non-Hispanic	342	218	63.7
Hispanic	527	391	74.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,231	4,420	84.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,195	416	34.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,152	416	36.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,745	2,348	62.7
Migratory students	622	347	55.8
Male	4,878	3,397	69.6
Female	4,604	3,803	82.6

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.

Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 596)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: No science test at this grade level. It is only given at grades 4, 8, and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.6 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	9,584	6,531	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,174	1,111	51.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	698	472	67.6
Black, non-Hispanic	331	177	53.5
Hispanic	508	326	64.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,331	4,097	76.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,174	311	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,173	419	35.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3,677	2,023	55.0
Migratory students	617	352	57.1
Male	4,915	3,335	67.9
Female	4,669	3,196	68.5

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.

Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 542)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.2.6 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	9,642	7,596	78.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,191	1,304	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	694	529	76.2
Black, non-Hispanic	335	253	75.5
Hispanic	509	412	80.9
White, non-Hispanic	5,369	4,677	87.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,183	406	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,175	499	42.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,705	2,428	65.5
Migratory students	618	395	63.9
Male	4,951	3,646	73.6
Female	4,691	3,950	84.2

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.

Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 544)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	9,302	4,769	51.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,102	569	27.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	685	269	39.3
Black, non-Hispanic	323	104	32.2
Hispanic	495	215	43.4
White, non-Hispanic	5,174	3,364	65.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,141	178	15.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,140	94	8.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,566	1,189	33.3
Migratory students	594	193	32.5
Male	4,768	2,473	51.9
Female	4,534	2,296	50.6
Comments: note that the sum of the race/ethnicity category will not equal the total of All Students because AK reports multi-racial (Ct=523) in its total.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.7 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	19,240	11,902	61.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,470	1,886	42.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,374	856	62.3
Black, non-Hispanic	661	286	43.3
Hispanic	1,049	580	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	10,682	7,647	71.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,124	456	21.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,330	578	24.8
Economically disadvantaged students	6,577	2,966	45.1
Migratory students	1,264	617	48.8
Male	9,872	6,173	62.5
Female	9,368	5,729	61.2

Comments: There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.
Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 1004)
Note that this data contains both grade 9 and grade 10 populations

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.2.7 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	19,566	14,903	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,576	2,523	55.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,391	1,012	72.8
Black, non-Hispanic	670	459	68.5
Hispanic	1,060	776	73.2
White, non-Hispanic	10,830	9,323	86.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,165	723	33.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,384	838	35.2
Economically disadvantaged students	6,735	4,054	60.2
Migratory students	1,284	785	61.1
Male	10,025	7,173	71.6
Female	9,541	7,730	81.0

Comments: Our high school data for math and RLA includes both grade 9 and grade 10 results, science however is only gr 10
There has been an increase of Hispanic students since last year.
Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 1039)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	9,025	5,445	60.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,047	783	38.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	647	335	51.8
Black, non-Hispanic	302	116	38.4
Hispanic	454	214	47.1
White, non-Hispanic	5,097	3,706	72.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	926	233	25.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,049	176	16.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,897	1,229	42.4
Migratory students	594	253	42.6
Male	4,544	2,795	61.5
Female	4,481	2,650	59.1
Comments: only grade 10 tests in science			
Also note that the sum of the ethnic/race categories will not equal the total of All students as Alaska reports by Multi-ethnic category (ct = 478)			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	501	295	58.9
Districts	54	27	50.0
Comments:			

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 2007-08 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 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	275	163	59.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	116	56	48.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	159	107	67.3
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

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 2007-08. 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 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
51	25	49.0
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

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 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met 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 met 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 met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (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 (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	16
Extension of the school year or school day	5
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	6
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments: Some schools reported more than 1 corrective action.	

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

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* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	4
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	32
Comments: Some schools reported more than one option.	

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

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other major restructuring of the school governance" actions generally included a combination of changes in the structure of the school day or year as well as the structure of leadership at the school. Some districts are taking a stronger role in decision-making at local schools, others are implementing advisory committees at the local school level.

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 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met 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 met 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 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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 and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly 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.

Alaska requires districts identified for improvement and corrective action to submit district improvement plans for review and approval by the department. Those plans are reviewed and technical assistance is provided to districts. Recommendations are provided for improvement in the plans. Technical assistance audio conferences are held to discuss requirements of district improvement plans and strategies for improvement. Presentations on using data to drive instructional decisions and on using formative assessments aligned to state standards have been by audio conference and at major state conferences.

When a district reaches the level of corrective action, the department performs a desk audit of available data, including student achievement and AYP data. A new component of Alaska's review and support for low-performing schools and districts became effective in spring 2008 upon passage of new legislation that requires the department to conduct school-level desk audits of all schools in the state. Schools that meet criteria under Alaska regulation 4 AAC 06.872 for being the lowest performing are identified as needing additional analysis. The regulation also requires that the department consult with the superintendent of the district about the reasons the schools have been identified and what actions are being taken by the district to increase student achievement. Many of these identified schools are Title I schools, but some are not. Based on the evaluation of the district level data and individual school data, the commissioner's office is holding conference calls individually with each district in corrective action or with schools identified under the new legislation. Based on the desk-audit review of district data, the school-level desk audits, and the conversations with each superintendent, districts are identified that will receive an on-site visit by an Instructional Audit Team in selected schools in the district to identify a school's strengths and challenges.

A team of Alaskan educators visits schools in corrective action or restructuring to examine documents, observe classroom instruction and interview teachers, administrators and students. Their work is guided by the Instructional Audit Tool which focuses on six domains relevant to school improvement planning: curriculum, instruction, assessment, school learning environment, professional development and leadership. While the development of the audit tool and the on-site instructional audit process was led by the Alaska Comprehensive Center, the department is taking a greater role in using this process to identify areas of need and ways to provide support to schools and districts in corrective action and restructuring.

To date, schools have been visited in 6 of the lowest-performing districts. Information gathered from the on-site visits was used to create the plan of corrective action that the department requires the districts to take to positively impact student achievement. In one case the district voluntarily put the plan for corrective action in place, and has consulted with the state regarding implementation. The department will take corrective action that is most likely to positively impact student achievement. The corrective action plans require districts to implement these key elements: universal screening for all students, benchmark formative assessments at least 3 times per year; additional progress monitoring assessments for students needing strategic interventions; and use of regular teacher collaboration meetings to discuss student progress data and make decisions about appropriate instruction and interventions. The department has trained District Improvement coaches and each district receives the assistance of a coach.

Districts in Improvement or Corrective Action receive the following technical assistance based on Alaska's 3-tiered model of support. (See response to 1.4.4.2)

Tier 2 - Targeted Access

Districts at Level 2 or above (Improvement) are provided with more directed technical assistance. This technical assistance is more directed and specific to the district needs. The following is assistance available from the department: Suggested formative assessment (Curriculum Based Measures - CBMs) to monitor progress and provide data to guide instruction; Site leadership training; and Consultation and online suggestions for school and district improvement planning.

Tier 3 - Intervention Access

Provide districts at Level 4 (Corrective Action) in most need of support with structured detailed technical assistance. The assistance available from the department is: Formative assessment system (CBMs); Site specific professional development - curriculum, leadership and instruction; Work with a District Improvement Coach to promote improved academic achievement; and Professional development in data based decision making, progress monitoring, formative assessments, and teacher collaboration meetings.

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

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* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	20
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

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 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	2	1
Schools	0	0
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	10/03/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	10,299	10,481
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	4,882	5,069
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	47.4	48.4
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	5,303	5,380
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	51.5	51.3
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	106	
Comments:		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	24
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	12
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	70
Comments:	

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		14	2	4	D	Improved school index score, a state measure of total growth in academic achievement for all students.
2		33	3	6	D	Improved school index score, a state measure of total growth in academic achievement for all students.
3		6	0	3	D	Improved school index score, a state measure of total growth in academic achievement for all students.
6 = Combo 1	Combination of strategy 1 (technical assistance & professional development) with strategy 2 (change in instructional practices).	34	6	6	A	
7 = Combo 2	Combination of strategies 1 (technical assistance & professional development), 2 (change in instructional practices), and 3 (partnerships).	21	1	5	A	
5	Extended learning opportunities such as before or after school tutoring or summer school.	55	5	14	A	
5	Parent involvement strategy such as using a parent liaison.	8	1	0	A	
5	Drop out prevention or increased graduation rate strategies.	6	2	1	A	
Comments: Some schools are reported in several categories. Of the most common positive outcome, for schools that showed an increase of 5% or more in 2 or more AYP cells, the second most common positive outcome for those schools was an increase in the school index score, and vice versa.						

Column 1 Response Options Box

- 1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
- 4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

- A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
- B = Increased teacher retention
- C = Improved parental involvement
- D = Other

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The department shares effective school improvement strategies primarily by providing workshops on specific strategies and by providing sessions at the annual Winter Education Conference. The department has sponsored workshops in Response to Instruction/Intervention and workshops in Curriculum Alignment targeted to districts in corrective action. General sessions and breakout sessions have been provided at the Winter Conference on RTI, formative assessments, using data to make instructional decisions, effective teacher collaboration meetings, progress monitoring tools, and more. In addition, for the past several years, teams of educators from schools that were showing progress in AYP have been invited to participate at the Winter Education Conference to share the strategies they have used in their schools. The Title I Distinguished Schools have also been asked to present at the Winter Education Conference.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 1003(g) funds reserved by the state for evaluation and technical assistance have been used to support the district improvement coaches and the targeted workshops on curriculum alignment and Response to Instruction/Intervention.

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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.

1.4.9.1.2 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, corrective action or restructuring.
- (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	17,324
Applied to transfer	56
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	56

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

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

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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	\$ 28,835
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

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	20
Comments:	

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

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.

1.4.9.2.2 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	13,001
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,506
Received supplemental educational services	1,389
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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	\$ 1,447,365
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of 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 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	21,650	18,602	85.9	3,048	14.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1,900	1,479	77.8	421	22.2
Low-poverty schools	2,575	1,814	70.4	761	29.6
All elementary schools	8,562	6,818	79.6	1,744	20.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	1,259	1,095	87.0	164	13.0
Low-poverty schools	4,862	4,391	90.3	471	9.7
All secondary schools	13,088	11,784	90.0	1,304	10.0
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 below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state counts a full-day self-contained elementary class as one class.

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

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% 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. 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	92.6
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	6.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.8
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because Alaska counts all K-8 and K-12 schools as elementary schools, the percentage of elementary school classes not taught by HQT teachers includes secondary level classes. Of the 92.6% of general education classes taught by certified teachers who did not demonstrate subject-matter knowledge, 9.6% represent elementary classes and 83% represents secondary level classes taught in elementary schools. The Other category represents special education teachers that are not endorsed in special education, therefore not highly qualified in special education.

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)	80.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	19.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Other category represents special education teachers that are not endorsed in special education, therefore not highly qualified in special education.

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	82.5	33.3
Poverty metric used	Free & Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	52.8	22.6
Poverty metric used	Free & Reduced Lunch	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types 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>.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Yupik, Spanish, Russian
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual	Spanish, Yupik, Russian
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Yupik
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Yupik
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No Response</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	15,879
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.2.2 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.	15,355
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Yupik	6,120
Inupiaq	2,124
Spanish	1,987
Filipino	1,225
Samoan	902

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hmong - 783, Russian - 637

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	15,887
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,626
Total	17,513
Comments: 9.28% of the LEP students were not tested in 2007-2008. Reasons included students moving into or out of a district during the test window, illness, parent or student refusal.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,704
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	9.7
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	13,911
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,444
Total	15,355
Comments: Approximately 9.4% of the Title III served LEP students did not test on the annual ELP assessment.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 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. **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.
3. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	4,871	31.8
ELP attainment	1,493	9.7
Comments: Due to a change in the LEP exit criteria in 2007, the 2007-2008 year was the first year students were not required to score proficient on the ELP assessment two years in a row. This produced a smaller percent of students making progress or attaining proficiency than anticipated.		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

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

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

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
3,692	930	4,622
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
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 MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,728	3,061	82.1	667
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
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 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
3,740	3,336	89.2	404
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science 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 MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,034	513	49.6	521
Comments:			

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. 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.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	12
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	2
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	10
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	12
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	11
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	11
Comments: The 11 subgrantees reported for not meeting AMAOs for 4 or more consecutive years are included in the number (12) that were reported for not meeting for 2 consecutive years.	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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 who participated 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 language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
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) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
880	210	2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

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 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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.	816
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	34

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

* 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

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics 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	12	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	10	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	8	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	9	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	12	1,320
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	8	437
PD provided to principals	12	154
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	11	72
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	10	354
PD provided to community based organization personnel	4	65
Total		2,402

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	09/04/07	66
Comments:		

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts are encouraged to submit all required grant application information by late May, with a deadline of June 30. The state reviews and responds to applications received within two weeks. Most district program staff are out of the office during the month of July which delays district responses to the department until August. The Department provides technical assistance to districts to ensure district applications are in compliance to ensure that grants are ready to be approved as soon as the funds become available. We will continue to reach out to districts and resolve any outstanding requirements in as timely manner as possible.

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

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 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	63.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	51.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	66.0
Black, non-Hispanic	50.0
Hispanic	52.7
White, non-Hispanic	70.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	39.4
Limited English proficient	50.0
Economically disadvantaged	53.1
Migratory students	59.0
Male	59.6
Female	66.4
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.7
Black, non-Hispanic	7.2
Hispanic	6.5
White, non-Hispanic	3.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6.3
Limited English proficient	8.4
Economically disadvantaged	7.4
Migratory students	6.4
Male	8.5
Female	7.3
Comments:	

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	50	50
LEAs with subgrants	4	4
Total	54	54
Comments:		

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17	64
K	39	197
1	33	205
2	26	170
3	28	166
4	16	181
5	29	134
6	13	125
7	20	121
8	28	158
9	45	180
10	34	202
11	41	313
12	78	300
Ungraded		
Total	447	2,516
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	160	778
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	245	1,374
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	22	220
Hotels/Motels	20	144
Total	447	2,516
Comments:		

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

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)	63
K	180
1	187
2	160
3	153
4	162
5	123
6	119
7	108
8	140
9	158
10	173
11	274
12	278
Ungraded	
Total	2,278
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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	665
Migratory children/youth	160
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	418
Limited English proficient students	288
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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
Tutoring or other instructional support	4
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	4
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	3
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	4
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	4
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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	146	91
4	146	107
5	114	68
6	114	63
7	94	48
8	128	47
High School	253	87
Comments: Our high school assessment population includes grades 9 and 10		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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	146	84
4	146	90
5	114	73
6	114	67
7	94	57
8	128	61
High School	253	132
Comments: Our high school population consists of grades 9 and 10		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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*.

Note: 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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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)	503
K	713
1	604
2	693
3	686
4	676
5	671
6	714
7	695
8	725
9	758
10	761
11	644
12	660
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	400
Total	9,903

Comments:

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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)	116
K	67
1	96
2	122
3	98
4	104
5	79
6	83
7	74
8	85
9	74
10	73
11	58
12	9
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,148
Comments: The category 2 count has been revised from the previously submitted count due to new information obtained by the SEA.	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Alaska Migrant Education Program used MIS2000 as our migrant student information system to compile and generate our 2007-2008 child count for both Categories 1 and 2. Our child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data collected and maintained in MIS2000 includes student demographic and move information provided on the COE.

The same information is collected for regular and summer terms. The type of information collected on the COE:

1. Student Name - legal (last, first, middle)
2. Birth Data - sex, data of birth, age, multiple birth, ethnicity, place of birth
3. Current School Information - school name, enrollment date and grade
4. Parents' names - mother's and father's names (last and first)
5. Homebase - address of permanent residence and phone contact
6. Residence of Qualifying Worker - residence where the qualifying worker lives if different from the homebase
7. Eligibility Data - residency date; qualifying arrival date; move (to-from) information; name of qualifying worker; check boxes for "with," "to join," (for to join moves, the date the qualifying worker moved is recorded and must be within 12 months of the child's QAD) or "on own"; check boxes to indicate whether the qualifying worker was the parent, guardian, spouse, or self; check boxes to indicate if the qualifying worker obtained or sought, seasonal or temporary work; check boxes to indicate if the qualifying worker engaged in commercial or subsistence fishing, agriculture or logging; description of work - type of catch/crop/logging camp and type of gear/activity. Qualifying work activity information is found in our Alaska Harvest Manual: Reference Manual for Records Managers and Recruiters. This publication is updated yearly. Also, the Eligibility Section contains a check box to indicate that the move was more than 20 miles within the boundaries of a district over 15,000 square miles; a check box to indicate that additional moves were made within the preceding 12 months that together establish a pattern of mobility interrupting the child's education or home life and space to list the additional moves.
8. Additional Eligibility Documentation - this is the area where the documentation of economic necessity is recorded. The information recorded is for all persons living in the household during the qualifying work activity year.

The information documented includes: name of employed person, relationship to child, description of work, name of employer, hours per week and months per year (approximately) that each person worked during this period. If there is not additional employment in the family, the interviewer writes "none" in this area to show that they did ask for this information and there was no additional employment. The total number of people living in the household is recorded. Also, there is space for verifying that the migrant work is an economic necessity. Parents initial and date a statement certifying their reliance on the qualifying activity as an economic necessity. In addition, there is a comment section where the interviewer can note important facts pertaining to the move or the family situation.

Additional information comes from regular term Mass Withdrawal forms and Summer School Mass Enrollment and Withdrawal forms, and includes enroll/withdraw dates, grades, termination codes and supplemental programs information.

School districts assist the state with recruitment efforts. They hire recruiters to conduct the interviews with the families and complete the necessary forms.

Using a pre-printed or blank COE form, recruiters interview parents and ask relevant questions in order to accurately complete the information required on the COE (effective interview techniques are presented in the Alaska Harvest Manual and at Fall Training). Migrant move and student information is written on the COE form throughout the interview. As the interview comes to an end, the recruiter reviews the completed COE form for accuracy using checklists in the training materials. If any information is unclear, the recruiter will ask additional clarifying questions. The parent reviews the COE for accuracy and signs the COE to verify that the information is correct.

Recruiters work in conjunction with school secretaries or home-school liaison staff in order to identify new families that move into their communities and to interview them for possible migrant activities.

The majority of recruitment for eligible migrant students is done in the fall because most qualifying work activities take place during the summer. Schools start closing in May to accommodate traditional migration to fish camp. The fishing seasons are determined by nature and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and vary depending on the species being harvested. Because of the remote, isolated fish camp locations and large distances between villages (where schools are located) and traditional fish camp sites, it is not possible to have recruitment staff available at the fish camp sites. The recruitment therefore takes place immediately after the summer fishing season from mid-August to November. During that period, all new migrant moves are documented and all currently eligible migrant student families are interviewed to determine whether a new move was made.

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

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.

When COEs are completed and signed by the recruiter and the parent, the COE is sent to the district office where the district records manager will review the COE for errors or ambiguity and ascertain whether the family actually meets the migrant eligibility criteria. Once the records manager feels confident that the COE is error free and that the family meets migrant eligibility, he/she enters the COE into the student information system, MIS2000. Each district has one workstation with MIS2000 and one records manager trained in the database; this controls data input into the system. When COEs are entered onto the district's MIS2000 workstation and uploaded, then the COE data is electronically transferred to the State of Alaska's main server.

The full MIS2000 database is housed on the State of Alaska Department of Administration's main server. This database contains all records inputted by districts into MIS2000. When a district finishes an electronic upload, eligibility specialists at the Alaska Migrant Education Office will review the submitted COEs. In situations where COEs need additional or updated information, an e-mail will be sent to the district. Districts will then have the opportunity to resubmit the updated COEs through the same electronic process. When COEs are first entered, they are marked with a "Ready for Review" status. After the COE has been reviewed it will then be placed in one of three categories: Incomplete, Cancelled, or Active. Incomplete means that the COE seems to meet eligibility requirements but additional information is needed. Cancelled means that the COE does not meet eligibility requirements and the family has been made ineligible. Active means that the COE is complete and the family meets eligibility requirements. When a COE is marked as Active, all children on the COE are marked as eligible. The eligibility specialists routinely run reports from the MIS2000 database to determine the status of COEs.

Once COE data has been inputted and updated by district staff and has met eligibility requirements, the data is ready to be organized into the child count report. To do this, an identification and recruitment specialist runs a report in MIS2000's "Report Builder" menu that pulls an extract of all students with a school history line between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08. This extract pulls students based on their Student Sequence number, a unique number assigned by MIS2000 that cannot be manipulated by users. Selecting the data by Student Sequence number ensures that each individual record is pulled and eliminates the possibility of duplication. Once the extract has been successfully imported into Microsoft Access, various queries are performed to ensure that the data is accurate, complete, and absent of any duplication. These queries are used to pinpoint incorrect data entry along with data integrity errors. From these queries, identification and recruitment specialists are able to work with eligibility specialists and district staff to fix the remaining errors. Once all reports have been run and the accuracy of the information has been examined and verified, the count is certified and submitted.

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.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alaska Migrant Education Program develops a series of queries for the MIS2000 database that provide the data necessary to ensure an accurate child count.

Regular Term (category 1)

- Residency 09/01/07- 08/31/08
- Must be 3 years old
- Must be less than 22 years old
- Unduplicated - run alpha by state (student name, Student ID, birth date, parents' names, QAD, residency date, enrollment date)
- QAD within last three years
- Check for termination codes
- Verify with districts on 12th graders not graduated

Summer Term (category 2)

- Make sure regular and summer enrollments do not overlap
- Must be 3 years old
- Must be less than 22 years old
- Unduplicated - run alpha by state (name, ID, birth date, parents' names)
- QAD within last three years.
- Enrolled in MEP funded summer school
- Be sure these students are also included in category 1 count.

The child count data is compiled by running several reports in MIS2000 and queries in Microsoft Access. First, a report is run in MIS2000 which provides an alphabetical listing of eligible children, ages 3-21 who, within three years of making a qualifying move, resided in Alaska for one or more days during the period from September 1, 2007 - August 31, 2008. There are separate reports for the regular school term and summer term. Additional "find duplicate" queries are run on this eligible student list in Microsoft Access to examine such issues as duplicate student ID numbers, names, multiple births, date of birth and terminations. When duplication occurs, the student records are researched in MIS2000 by examining the COE and student data. If additional clarification is needed, MEO staff contact the district or family directly to resolve whether the data reflects two separate students or is duplicate information for the same student. All duplicates are identified and removed (or merged, if appropriate) in MIS2000, so they do not appear in the final eligible student list or eligible student count reports.

For both regular and summer terms, the MEO staff run queries to make sure the child count contains students who fit the following criteria:

1. Residency 09/01/07 - 08/31/08
2. Must be 3 years old
3. Must be less than 22 years old
4. QAD within the last three years
5. COEs status active and eligible

The MEO staff ensure that the children in the state database who turn three during the funding period are still residing in the state. As part of the state's identification and recruitment process, children are tracked by the state database from the first time they make qualifying moves with their families. Since all children with eligibility are contacted yearly and their information is verified, it is not necessary to send specific information to the recruiters.

For the summer term, the students must be enrolled in a Migrant Education Program funded summer school. These summer school students are included in the regular term count. Students who attend summer school only must be reflected in the category 1 count. The queries are run to ensure that the regular and summer enrollments do not overlap.

The eligible student list and child count information from MIS2000 is edited and filtered through several additional queries. Regarding 12th grade students, MEO checks for graduation termination codes. If no code is present, MEO verifies with districts that the students have not graduated. Queries are run to check for twins and triplets and the information is crosschecked with the student record in MIS2000. As mentioned above, several queries are run to locate and resolve duplicate information.

The following is an example of how duplications are handled. John Smith, born 8/1/90 would be noted if another John Smith, born 5/1/98 was on the list. Or, two Mary Smiths each having Robert Smith as a parent would be highlighted. Even students with the same last name and same parents that have been born within an unusually small time period (such as within 10 days of each other) are highlighted. Entries

with similarities or "coincidences" are highlighted. All highlighted entries are investigated by researching the actual COE and/or previous computer entries. Based upon the information obtained, the student is either removed as a duplicate or it is determined that there are two separate children and both records remain in the count.

MEO staff run additional queries to find students or COEs that are flagged as ineligible, inactive or not determined. MEO staff review each record with these pending or inactive markers in MIS2000 to verify that the status is accurate. The final eligible student list is edited so it does not include students who are flagged as pending, inactive or ineligible. MEO staff double check the final eligible student list against the final count report to verify that the number of students on each report is identical.

The unduplicated count is run by name, Student ID, birth date and parents' names. For the summer/intersession count, students are not enrolled into the system as having attended summer school unless a supplemental program is also being reported. A report is generated to verify the names of any students enrolled in summer school who did not have a supplemental programs code reported. Districts are also required to maintain documentation of services provided on-site. These are reviewed as part of the program reviews conducted by the Department of Education & Early Development. None of Alaska's districts operate intersession projects.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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 Alaska Migrant Education Program provides ongoing training and a multi-layered COE quality review process to ensure that migrant student eligibility is properly determined and verified each year. Records managers and recruiters are trained annually in the identification and recruitment process. In the fall, training sessions are held for administrators, records managers and recruiters in six regional centers throughout the state. The three-day training sessions include an in-depth review of eligibility guidelines and extensive practice sessions using ID&R tools (i.e. Alaska Harvest Manual, Recruiter Guide) to determine eligibility and properly complete COEs. All training materials are updated annually and distributed to all district staff who are responsible for migrant education identification and recruitment. Training continues during the fall recruitment season on an individual basis. District records managers work one-on-one with new recruiters. ID&R specialists work with district staff on additional training needs and plans designed specifically for individual districts. Every COE is reviewed for compliance with eligibility guidelines at least three times before it is entered in MIS2000. The recruiter first reviews the COE with the parent when conducting the family interview and obtaining signatures. The records manager conducts a quality review of the COE verifying all the information and signatures. If the records manager finds an error or needs more clarification, s/he instructs the recruiter to re-contact the family. A district representative conducts a third review of the COE and s/he verifies that the COE meets eligibility guidelines by signing the COE form. As the district records manager enters the COE data into MIS2000 s/he verifies that the electronic and paper COEs match verbatim.

In addition to these quality control procedures, MEO staff meet regularly throughout the year to assess program needs and develop new quality improvement ideas. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet weekly to discuss any districts that are having difficulty completing COEs or making proper eligibility determinations. The group collectively decides on internal actions or new procedures that can be developed to resolve the problem most efficiently. The eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists meet on a weekly basis with the migrant education program manager to discuss specific COE eligibility (as noted above) and any new information pertaining to national laws and guidance. Under the program manager's guidance, the MEO team reviews the long-term training needs and quality improvement efforts that can be implemented during the following school year.

MEO staff also provide ongoing training and communication with districts to improve the quality of our program. For example, ID&R specialists send a monthly email to records managers to address common questions and issues that arise during the COE quality review process. This is beneficial to districts with a new or inexperienced staff that may have questions once they begin the recruiting after fall training. Districts can also request an audio conference with their recruiters or MEO staff to discuss problems they are having with the ID&R process. For ongoing issues with districts, eligibility specialists and ID&R specialists hold an audio conference with district staff to offer targeted training and to develop quality improvement plans to resolve the issues quickly. MEO staff frequently ask for feedback from districts about ways to improve our program.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alaska ID&R specialists visit approximately 10 districts per year as a part of our technical assistance program. During these on-site technical assistance visits, ID&R specialists conduct a thorough review of the district's identification and recruitment procedures, migrant student files and compliance with eligibility guidelines. Using a Random Student Sample Report generated from MIS2000, the ID&R specialist contacts families in sequential order from the list. The ID&R specialist re-interviews the family regarding migrant activity using the Migrant Eligibility Interview Protocol form for the interview. The information from the interview is compared to the current COE for accuracy. Every effort is made to contact families that have been recruited by each recruiter in the district. The completed Migrant Eligibility Interview Protocol form is kept on file at the MEO.

During 2007-2008, 161 students were re-interviewed. Of those students, 154 fully met migrant qualifications. Seven of the students interviewed were misidentified and were removed from services. Re-interviews were conducted through both phone and face-to-face interviews. Re-interviewing was conducted by the state ID&R specialists who are well-trained in eligibility requirements and have full access to training materials, the Alaska Harvest Manual, and federal guidance. All recruitment interviews in Alaska are made by recruiters at the LEA level. The SEA re-interviews work independently from the LEA original interviewer.

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

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.

The Migrant Education Office (MEO) follows several quality control procedures throughout the school year to maintain the accuracy and integrity of migrant student data in MIS2000. These procedures center on COE quality reviews, verification reports and random sample

COE reviews during technical assistance visits.

In order to ensure the integrity of migrant student records and COEs in MIS2000, all data collected from previous years is locked. This ensures that district personnel will not overwrite previously certified COEs and associated student information.

In the fall recruitment season, the second phase of COE review process takes place at the state. Upon receipt of the uploaded COE data in MIS2000, the eligibility specialists quality check every COE (New and No New Move). The eligibility specialists carefully review the COE data to ensure that the migrant activity, migrant move, intent of the move and economic necessity for the migrant activity are clearly in alignment with eligibility guidelines. They also review the family and student data for accuracy and correct chronological order. Based on this preliminary state review, the electronic COE is flagged as active, incomplete or cancelled.

Eligibility specialists then prepare a COE status report for the district records managers to indicate whether COEs are approved, need more information or are denied. The report lists the COE ID number, student names, birth date, State ID number and a space for comments. If approved, a notation of "Approved" is listed in comments. If the COE is incomplete, the eligibility specialist notes the details or questions that need to be answered in order to make an eligibility determination. If the COE is denied, this is noted on the report. These COE status reports are kept at the MEO to track the adjustments made to COEs. In MIS2000, the COE and student records remain in "incomplete" and "not determined" status while the district is obtaining the additional information. MEO staff run frequent reports of all students in "not determined status" to capture these pending cases and ensure that they are resolved prior to the child count deadline. Once the district obtains and uploads the additional information, the eligibility specialists conduct a final review and make a final eligibility determination.

If the eligibility specialists question data on a COE, they pass the COE on to the ID&R specialists for a secondary review. If more clarification is needed, the ID&R specialists will contact the records manager at the district to ask more detailed questions or instruct the recruiter to ask for more specific clarification from the family. Upon receipt of updated COE information in MIS2000 the eligibility specialists make a final eligibility determination and update the COE status in MIS2000 accordingly.

In cases where the COE data is still not clear, or when the eligibility determination is difficult to make, the MEO staff conducts a third in-house quality check of the COE. Under the guidance of the migrant education program manager, the MEO staff meets to discuss the facts of the case as a group and closely consult the Non-Regulatory Guidance for direction. The group documents the date, factors discussed and outcome on the COE form and the eligibility specialists or ID&R specialists follow through accordingly.

MEO staff run internal verification reports from MIS2000 to ensure that uploaded COE data is complete and that eligibility determinations are accurate. During the fall recruitment season, eligibility specialists run weekly reports of pending student records that are flagged as "not determined" and COEs that are flagged as "ready for review" or "incomplete." There are separate reports for New and No New Move COEs. The resulting student lists are checked against COE status reports to determine the steps necessary for making the final eligibility determination. ID&R specialists run statewide reports from MIS2000 to review and monitor COE data upload activity by districts and gauge the rate at which the work is completed. The ID&R specialists then use the report data to spot check COEs and assist districts with any COE entry issues. Eligibility specialists continue to run these "pending status" reports throughout the year on a weekly basis. ID&R specialists run additional quarterly reports to check for potential duplicate records, discrepancies in student data (such as ID number or date of birth) or incorrect chronology when students migrate between schools or districts in a school year. Discrepancies are resolved by the ID&R specialists who contact districts and the state assessments office to obtain the correct information in MIS2000.

If a student is reported or discovered to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R specialist at the MEO follows an eligibility termination procedure to research, terminate and report this misidentification. At training, districts are instructed to contact the MEO if they find problems or discrepancies with any COE at any point in the year. The ID&R specialists investigate any potential eligibility problems that are either reported by districts or are discovered during regular quality checks at the MEO. ID&R specialists document the issue, conduct an investigation, document initial findings and then meet with the Migrant Education Program Manager to discuss the case and make a final determination.

If a student is determined to be inaccurately identified for migrant education, the ID&R specialist terminates the student and COE in MIS2000 under the code "I" (ineligible) to indicate the student was terminated because they were found ineligible. This changes the record from "active and eligible" to "cancelled and ineligible." The reason for the termination is added to all affected COEs in the database. Reference is made to the additional documentation made by the ID&R specialist. This additional documentation consists of a list of all affected student names, ID numbers and COE ID numbers and a detailed description of the problem, how it was researched, findings by the ID&R specialist, the official date of termination and proof that the termination was completed in MIS2000 (print screens). The ID&R specialist then notifies the district in writing that the student is terminated, the reason for this decision and the effective date of the termination. The district is informed that the MEO has terminated the student in MIS2000 and is instructed to complete the termination by documenting the termination on the original COE in the district file. Districts must write the termination code "I" (ineligible) and reason for the ineligibility finding on each affected COE form.

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

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.

MEO staff do several final reviews to verify the accuracy of the child count produced in MIS2000 for this report. MEO staff first review the SQL (Structured Query Language) parameters set for the queries used to produce the counts and other reports on a computerized relational database) of the queries used for the counts in category 1 and category 2. As described above, several queries are run on the eligible student list to identify duplicate student data and students with ineligible or inactive status in MIS2000. MEO staff research and resolve these issues and then update the electronic student record accordingly. The final eligible student list reflects this editing and review process and thus only includes students who are verified as eligible and active. Several different MEO staff review the final reports and

supporting documentation (queries) to ensure that the final count is accurate.

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

In the space below, 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.

A process is in place at the MEO to respond quickly and effectively should prospective interviewing results question a student's eligibility decision. If a mistake is found on a COE, the ID&R specialist will address these concerns with the district migrant education coordinator and records manager. The district staff will have an opportunity to respond or provide additional information about the case. The concerns will be brought back to the Migrant Program Manager at the MEO and additional research will be done, if necessary. If a student is determined not to be eligible, the ID&R specialist terminates the student and COE in MIS2000 and notifies the district of the ineligibility status in writing. If a pattern is discovered on the part of a specific recruiter or district, the ID&R specialist will create a district plan of action to clarify the problems and the steps the district must take to resolve them promptly. The plan usually requires the district to conduct additional quality review of COEs. The parameters of this quality review are set by the ID&R specialist and indicate the type and number of files to review. Re-interviews may also be required of the district. Following the visit, the ID&R specialist and district staff keep in regular contact to verify that the plan of action is being followed and the problems resolved.

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

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.

To the best of our knowledge, the eligibility determinations which are the basis for our child count are sound and accurate.

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