

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

FLORIDA



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Florida Department of Education	
Address: 325 W Gaines St, Suite 514 Tallahassee, Florida 32399	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Dr. Jan Morphew	
Telephone: (850)245-0657	
Fax: (850)245-5036	
e-mail: jan.morphew@fldoe.org	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Eric J. Smith	
_____ Signature	<u>Friday, March 7, 2008, 5:10:47 PM</u> Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

On January 17, 2006, the Florida State Board of Education adopted a six-year cycle that set forth a schedule for the regular review and revision of all K-12 content standards.

Reading and Language Arts content standards were adopted in January 2007.

Mathematics content standards were adopted in September 2007.

Science content standards were adopted in February 2008.

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Academic Assessment

Florida's academic content standards in reading were revised and subsequently approved by the State Board of Education on January 25, 2007. The revised mathematics academic content standards were approved September 18, 2007. In both cases, access points for students with significant cognitive disabilities have been incorporated into the standards and adopted by the State Board of Education.

The process of developing new tests takes several years. This time is required to ensure that all professional standards for high-stakes assessments are followed, including the involvement of educators. A careful process will ensure that the new tests aligned with the new standards are grade-level appropriate, and are valid and reliable. Furthermore, the awareness and adoption timeline for the new standards will allow districts time to fully implement the new standards to ensure that the need for instructional validity has been met.

During the new test development phase, students will continue to take the current forms of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Tests (FCAT). For reading and mathematics, the transition years will be 2007-08 through 2009-10. Preliminary analysis by the Department's Bureau of K-12 Assessment indicates that teaching the new reading standards will provide appropriate preparation for the transition years of FCAT reading standards, since they will not be tested until 2011. This is also true for FCAT Writing+. The Department will delay the revision of the writing assessment to coincide with the revision of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Writing exam. It is therefore likely that a new writing test will not be in place until 2012 or 2013.

The analysis of the new mathematics standards indicates that some grade-level content will need to be taught during the new test development phase in order to ensure instructional validity of the assessment.

The Department has developed a timeline for making revisions to Florida's assessments in reading and mathematics, as follows:

Fall 2007-Spring 2008 - Develop test design, item specifications, and new items

Fall 2008 - Conduct statewide educator reviews of new test items for content, bias, and sensitivity

Spring/Summer 2009 - Assemble items into field test forms

Spring 2010 - Conduct field testing of new items

Spring 2011 - Baseline NEW Test; First student scores reported on new test; Conduct vertical scaling study on new tests

Summer/Fall 2011 - Set new Achievement Levels and Graduation Scores

Spring 2012 - Report results with new achievement levels, student growth scores, and norm-referenced scores.

Florida will be implementing a new alternate assessment for students with significant disabilities in Spring 2008; this assessment is aligned with the Sunshine State Standards access points. Development work has been underway since April 2007, and a field test was completed in October/November 2007. Standard setting will occur in Spring/Summer 2008.

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

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

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Academic Assessment

As provided in indicator 1.1.2, the Department has developed the following timeline for making revisions to Florida's assessments in reading and mathematics, as follows:

Fall 2007 - Spring 2008 - Develop test design, item specifications, and new items

Fall 2008 - Conduct statewide educator reviews of new test items for content, bias, and sensitivity

Spring/Summer 2009 - Assemble items into field test forms

Spring 2010 - Conduct field testing of new items

Spring 2011 - Baseline NEW Test. First student scores reported on new test; conduct vertical scaling study on new tests.

Summer/Fall 2011 - Set new Achievement Levels and Graduation Scores

Spring 2012 - Report results with new achievement levels, student growth scores, and norm-referenced scores.

As indicated in the above timeline, the Department plans to set new academic achievement standards in summer/fall 2011. The method for setting these new academic achievement standards has not been determined at this time.

Prior to the revisions to the Sunshine State Standards, students with disabilities seeking a special diploma received instruction using the Sunshine State Standards for Special Diploma (SSS/SD). In response to mandates of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), access points were developed as part of the revision to the Sunshine State Standards. The decision was made to add the access points to the revised standards instead of having separate standard.

The access points reflect expectations that are aligned with Florida's academic content standards, and reflect the highest learning standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Embedded in the Sunshine State Standards, access points reflect the core intent of the standards with reduced levels of complexity. As a part of the Sunshine State Standards adoption process, the access points are written in conjunction with the general education standards. The new Florida Alternate Assessment will measure achievement on the Access Points.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Academic Assessment

Florida began reporting scores for its science assessment (FCAT Science) 2003, for Grades 5, 8, and 10.

Florida included the following pieces of evidence in our comprehensive submission for the Standards and Assessment Peer Review (dated January 25, 2006):

Science Sunshine State Standards (example)

Science Grade-Level Expectations (example)

Science Course Descriptions (example)

Evidence of approved academic achievement standards in science: State

Board of Education Rule 6A-1.09422 FCAT Requirements

Graphs of historic FCAT performance in Science

FCAT Test Design Summary

Subsequently, Florida submitted FCAT Science Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) for Peer Review and approval on January 16, 2007.

Florida received notification of our Peer Review status on June 27, 2007, of Full Approval with Recommendations.

Florida implemented its alternate science assessment at the same time as FCAT Science, and also in grades 5, 8, and 10.

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

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

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Prior to the revisions to the Sunshine State Standards, students with disabilities seeking a special diploma received instruction using the Sunshine State Standards for Special Diploma (SSS/SD). In response to mandates of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), access points were developed as part of the revision to the Sunshine State Standards. The decision was made to add the access points to the revised standards instead of having separate standard.

The access points reflect expectations that are aligned with Florida's academic content standards, and reflect the highest learning standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Embedded in the Sunshine State Standards, access points reflect the core intent of the standards with reduced levels of complexity. As a part of the Sunshine State Standards adoption process, the access points are written in conjunction with the general education standards. The new Florida Alternate Assessment will measure achievement on the Access Points. Currently, Florida is revising the science standards to provide world-class science standards for all students K-12 that include access points for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The revised standards were adopted by the State Board of Education February 2008.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	1637597	1593117	97.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4903	4755	97.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	37659	36921	98.0
Black, non-Hispanic	376290	363966	96.7
Hispanic	395909	386934	97.7
White, non-Hispanic	770539	749728	97.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	247879	233884	94.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	164586	161200	97.9
Economically disadvantaged students	772296	752487	97.4
Migratory students	13128	12830	97.7
Male	840075	815010	97.0
Female	797522	778107	97.6

Comments: As a condition for approving Florida's assessment system in 2007, the U.S. Department of Education required Florida to count participatory-level students with disabilities in the Florida Alternate Assessment Report (FAAR) as non-participants in the assessment process for *NCLB* accountability because this level is not linked to grade-level content. Without this reclassification of Florida's participatory-level students in the FAAR, the participation rates for students with disabilities would have exceeded 95% in both reading and mathematics.

Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.

There is no need for Florida to rerun the data reported in 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 because the data did include non-full year student data. We were mistaken that the non-full year students were not included in 1.2.1 and 1.2.3. (The data in 1.9.2.5.1 and 1.9.2.5.2 was resubmitted on 2/14/08 and contains non-full year students.)

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	82768	35.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	135794	58.1
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	15322	6.6
Total	233884	
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	1639107	1596083	97.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4905	4765	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	37687	36948	98.0
Black, non-Hispanic	376701	364895	96.9
Hispanic	396580	387843	97.8
White, non-Hispanic	770924	750766	97.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	248011	234693	94.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	164776	161462	98.0
Economically disadvantaged students	773009	754053	97.6
Migratory students	13141	12857	97.8
Male	841109	816892	97.1
Female	797998	779191	97.6

Comments: As a condition for approving Florida's assessment system in 2007, the U.S. Department of Education required Florida to count participatory-level students with disabilities in the Florida Alternate Assessment Report (FAAR) as non-participants in the assessment process for NCLB accountability because this level is not linked to grade-level content. Without this reclassification of Florida's participatory-level students in the FAAR, the participation rates for students with disabilities would have exceeded 95% in both reading and mathematics.

Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.

There is no need for Florida to rerun the data reported in 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 because the data did include non-full year student data. We were mistaken that the non-full year students were not included in 1.2.1 and 1.2.3. (The data in 1.9.2.5.1 and 1.9.2.5.2 was resubmitted on 2/14/08 and contains non-full year students.)

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	81446	34.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	137434	58.6
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	15813	6.7
Total	234693	
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.		

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198137	146630	74.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	602	480	79.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4414	3902	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	46108	26264	57.0
Hispanic	50298	35097	69.8
White, non-Hispanic	88381	74432	84.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33053	17572	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32155	19583	60.9
Economically disadvantaged students	107207	68428	63.8
Migratory students	1717	1010	58.8
Male	102299	76285	74.6
Female	95838	70345	73.4
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198236	137446	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	603	448	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4412	3604	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	46102	24117	52.3
Hispanic	50324	31417	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	88461	71631	81.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33081	14458	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32170	16518	51.3
Economically disadvantaged students	107268	62129	57.9
Migratory students	1719	826	48.1
Male	102371	68385	66.8
Female	95865	69061	72.0
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	192895	133645	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	585	426	72.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4648	3995	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	43297	22437	51.8
Hispanic	47855	31518	65.9
White, non-Hispanic	89010	69846	78.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	31439	14361	45.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25257	13884	55.0
Economically disadvantaged students	100421	58664	58.4
Migratory students	1634	876	53.6
Male	99076	68832	69.5
Female	93819	64813	69.1
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	192883	132312	68.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	584	421	72.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4643	3759	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	43284	22057	51.0
Hispanic	47855	29631	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	89013	70876	79.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	31479	13169	41.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25263	11962	47.3
Economically disadvantaged students	100432	56941	56.7
Migratory students	1635	711	43.5
Male	99061	65676	66.3
Female	93822	66636	71.0
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	189042	111630	59.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	569	336	59.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4474	3629	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	41523	16324	39.3
Hispanic	46740	25031	53.6
White, non-Hispanic	88924	61944	69.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	30300	9842	32.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20312	7968	39.2
Economically disadvantaged students	96036	44089	45.9
Migratory students	1510	612	40.5
Male	95918	58387	60.9
Female	93124	53243	57.2
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	189172	136044	71.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	569	436	76.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	4470	3805	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	41594	22926	55.1
Hispanic	46779	30925	66.1
White, non-Hispanic	88948	72637	81.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	30340	12848	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20311	9952	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	96119	58031	60.4
Migratory students	1514	763	50.4
Male	95979	66645	69.4
Female	93193	69399	74.5
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	194877	98664	50.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	571	318	55.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4501	3444	76.5
Black, non-Hispanic	44773	13385	29.9
Hispanic	47323	21384	45.2
White, non-Hispanic	91212	56419	61.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	29571	6546	22.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17311	5165	29.8
Economically disadvantaged students	97945	35668	36.4
Migratory students	1553	515	33.2
Male	100415	49918	49.7
Female	94462	48746	51.6
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	195010	121382	62.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	570	389	68.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4498	3587	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	44796	19066	42.6
Hispanic	47373	26536	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	91273	67221	73.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	29628	8893	30.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17311	5951	34.4
Economically disadvantaged students	98027	47611	48.6
Migratory students	1553	561	36.1
Male	100515	60309	60.0
Female	94495	61073	64.6
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	185263	110309	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	585	374	63.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4250	3508	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	40817	16354	40.1
Hispanic	43579	23591	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	90279	62805	69.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23565	6404	27.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14929	5107	34.2
Economically disadvantaged students	86506	39482	45.6
Migratory students	1224	455	37.2
Male	94881	56100	59.1
Female	90382	54209	60.0
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	185383	116884	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	585	398	68.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4252	3305	77.7
Black, non-Hispanic	40851	19063	46.7
Hispanic	43577	24350	55.9
White, non-Hispanic	90357	65734	72.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23641	7234	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14913	4517	30.3
Economically disadvantaged students	86568	42883	49.5
Migratory students	1220	385	31.6
Male	94968	57256	60.3
Female	90415	59628	65.9
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	196847	124387	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	589	422	71.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	4385	3697	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	45631	19159	42.0
Hispanic	46903	26647	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	93969	70695	75.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	27461	7563	27.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14673	5181	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	91842	45026	49.0
Migratory students	1480	670	45.3
Male	100368	63192	63.0
Female	96479	61195	63.4
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	197048	96631	49.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	591	314	53.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4382	2932	66.9
Black, non-Hispanic	45678	13293	29.1
Hispanic	46896	19212	41.0
White, non-Hispanic	94123	57823	61.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	27549	5240	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14647	2511	17.1
Economically disadvantaged students	91935	31761	34.5
Migratory students	1479	344	23.3
Male	100513	45539	45.3
Female	96535	51092	52.9
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	390458	244495	62.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1108	767	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	9182	7693	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	90011	36776	40.9
Hispanic	90207	50232	55.7
White, non-Hispanic	190918	142762	74.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	50927	13364	26.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27650	9561	34.6
Economically disadvantaged students	148885	71370	47.9
Migratory students	2582	1063	41.2
Male	196964	124062	63.0
Female	193494	120433	62.2
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.3.14 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	393204	149548	38.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1114	456	40.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	9220	4942	53.6
Black, non-Hispanic	90867	17157	18.9
Hispanic	91198	27271	29.9
White, non-Hispanic	191751	95566	49.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	51598	7556	14.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27944	2753	9.9
Economically disadvantaged students	150298	35303	23.5
Migratory students	2609	374	14.3
Male	198736	71873	36.2
Female	194468	77675	39.9
Comments: Per USDE guidance received on 12/26/07, Florida will re-run the data reported in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.9.2.5.1, and 1.9.2.5.2 to include non-full year student data. Florida estimates that the data will be reported to EDEN by mid-February 2008.			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	3223	1082	33.6
Districts	67		
Comments: Blank cells are equivalent to a total count of zero.			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	1339	375	28.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1305	362	27.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	34	13	38.2
Comments: Data are verified correct.			

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

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
67	0	0.0
Comments: Blank cells are equivalent to a total of zero.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

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

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Florida has approximately 3,500 schools, of which 1,348 received Title I funding in 2006-2007. Of these Title I schools, 1001 are current identified as "needing improvement." Specifically, 435 are currently "planning for restructuring" (school in need of improvement - year 4, or SINI-4), and 27 are currently restructuring (SINI-5).

All of these schools receive support in district and school improvement planning, including training and a FDOE-developed template that incorporates all of the requirements of Title I, training in Florida's Continuous Improvement Model, and ongoing access to FDOE staff. Department staff review school improvement plans and district improvement plans and use these plans as a framework when funding applications are reviewed to ensure that resources are aligned with school improvement activities.

The Department has prioritized SINI-4 and SINI-5 schools for receipt of the 4% set-aside under Title I. For those grants, Florida has created a funding formula based on student performance that results in a school-level allocation - but has provided each district with the discretion to target either those schools that are lowest-performing or other Title I schools in improvement status. This framework acknowledges that not only are federal resources a relatively small percentage of a district's funding, but also that districts often have already prioritized the lowest-performing schools for special initiatives or resources. The Department also has emphasized use of those funds specifically for additional instructional time and interventions for low-achieving students and subgroups.

The very lowest-achieving of these schools receive specific support through the statewide system of support, Assistance Plus, funded with both state and Federal resources. Assistance Plus provides dedicated facilitators who work as coaches at the school level, serving as partners in the school improvement process.

The FDOE has spent the last six months working with Brown University and the Florida and the Islands Comprehensive Center (FLICC) to re-think FDOE's role in the school improvement process. This work will continue for the next year, but already, FDOE has concluded that its focus must shift to building not school, but district-level capacity to improve and support schools. Currently, a district-level model is being pilot-tested in two districts.

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: Data not collected in Florida. Currently, the Florida DOE has these data as text since this reporting requirement was not clear. FDOE is examining several data sets to analyze the optimum, least redundant, way to collect and report these data as numeric (duplicated) counts.	

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	2
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	25
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Among the features that set Florida apart from other states is its district structure. Florida's school districts are contiguous with the 67 counties, placing 3 of Florida's districts in the "top 10" largest districts in the country. In part because of their size, 65 of these 67 districts are currently in "corrective action" under NCLB.

The Department has chosen to sanction these districts by requiring them to reallocate a percentage of their administrative funds based on the percentage of AYP indicators missed. These funds must be re-directed to specific, student-level interventions. These funds are separately granted, and the approval process is rigorous.

The Department provides these districts with specific support through a template developed for district improvement plans. These plans are reviewed and feedback is provided to districts. Districts have access to a series of professional development opportunities and support services, including:

Student Progression Guide. The purpose of the guide is to assist districts in revising and developing policies and procedures related to promotion and retention. District student progression plans help ensure that the required program of study, placement, promotion, reporting, retention, and assessment procedures are equitable and comprehensive, thereby providing accountability for all students.

Student Progression Plan. Current law requires each district school board to establish a comprehensive process for student progression, as well as standards for evaluating each student's performance. The student progression plan must be reviewed and revised periodically to ensure that it complies with any changes that may have been made to state law or school board policy and to ensure that the required programs of study, placement, promotion, reporting, retention, and assessment procedures are equitable and comprehensive, thereby providing accountability for all students.

Comprehensive School Reform Information. FDOE provides a comprehensive database of comprehensive school reform models in use across the U.S., as well as within Florida. It also includes the research base for each model, the 11 components of comprehensive school reform, and links to national databases on CSR.

Statewide School Improvement Workshops. These workshops cover a variety of topics including data-driven decision making and are open to up to three school improvement contacts within each district. Many of these workshops focus on Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), a Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle. This analytical process was designed to identify strengths and weaknesses in student performance as it relates to the summative assessment, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Plan - helps school leaders to facilitate an entire staff focus on targeted instructional intervention; Do - Study of FCAT data should lead to defined, focused activities designed to improve student achievement. Check - Periodically, school staff reviews student progress and re-teaches concepts or provides enrichment activities. Act - This data should assist staff in determining if modifications to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) are necessary.

Information Specialists. The Department maintains extensive databases of school reform topics, as well as in-state and out-of-state experts who can be contacted to provide specific guidance or training. (See <http://www.bsi.fsu.edu/newsdesk/waveseries/resref12.htm> as an example.)

Sunshine State Lighting Best Practices. Lighting Best Practices are user-friendly information summaries on hot topics that are being addressed by school improvement teams. The research has been condensed to assist school communities in their search for ideas and strategies to support educational goals and objectives. In addition to the information provided, resources and references often are included for more in-depth information about each topic.

e-Library. The Department's electronic library provides links to educational research, teaching strategies and best practices to assist with school reform. (See <http://www.bsi.fsu.edu/elibrary/index.htm>).

Statewide BSI Electronic Newsletter. This periodic newsletter provides deadline reminders, new resources, and announces workshops. BSI and BSA collaborate on the newsletter to further integrate Title I and school improvement.

FCAT Explorer/Florida Achieves-FOCUS. FCAT explorer is a practice program for skills tested on the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test. The FCAT Explorer/FOCUS Support Services Team is available to provide training to teachers and staff across the state. Support Services Staff can train any teacher, media specialist, school administrator, or other school staff in using the FCAT Explorer and FOCUS Teacher's Desk features.

D.A.R.T. Model (Data Disaggregation Tool). The DART model is a proven process for engaging the entire school staff in the vital steps important to the implementation of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). This data should assist staff in determining if modifications to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) are necessary. Schools will also gain insight into the comparative performance of student subgroups as defined by NCLB.

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	65
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 SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	08/21/07	08/21/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	06/29/07	06/29/07
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	27	17
Comments:		

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	07/30/07
---	----------

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

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

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Every year, a portion of Title I, Part A funding is reserved to assist districts in raising student achievement in Title I schools that have been identified as "schools in need of improvement" (SINI). Florida uses the following factors to determine the amount of funding for each district.

1. Number of schools in their second year of corrective action (SINI-4 schools). Because these schools are planning for restructuring, and are expected to make significant changes, their per-pupil allocation is the highest.
2. Number of schools in their first year of corrective action (SINI-3 schools).
3. Number of schools in their second year of improvement (SINI-2 schools).

Funding amounts are calculated based on the number of each type of school and the percentage of Level 1 readers at each school, based on the 2006 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test.

The funds must be used to improve student achievement in Title I schools that are not making adequate yearly progress. However, districts have the flexibility to target these funds to fewer schools, or to a specific use that is consistent with current, approved district and school improvement plans, integrated with Title I requirements and implemented using Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).

There are a few restrictions on the way these funds can be used. They cannot be diverted wholly or in part to other schools or activities in the district. As with other federal programs, the funds must be used to supplement and may not supplant other funds. Activities, goods, and services acquired through the use of these funds must comply with all the requirements of Title I. Professional development activities are capped at 5% of the total amount, and must be calculated within the indirect costs. Funds may be used to expand supplemental educational services, if the District attests that it has first implemented SES with fidelity and exhausted those funds. Funds are targeted first to level one students. Remaining funds may be used to target additional levels.

To access these funds, districts must submit a formal application, including AYP data. The application must describe the district's rationale in terms of which schools are to be funded, which subgroups are targeted, which content areas are targeted, and why the funded activities are likely to increase the school's achievement.

Department staff review and approve applications, and districts are required to submit evaluation data.

Funded activities included additional teacher time for intensive student intervention, computer programs, data team meetings, additional tutoring, Saturday academies and afterschool programs, math manipulatives and reading programs.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

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

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	585
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	455
Comments: Data for this element were inadvertently entered incorrectly into the 05-06 CSPR report. The 06-07 data reported are consistent with the data that should have been entered into the 05-06 CSPR report.	

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

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	762724
Who applied to transfer	16935
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	14905

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 7050032
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	3
Comments:	

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

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	873
Comments:	

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

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

FAQ about supplemental education services

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

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	428268
Who applied for supplemental educational services	128942
Who received supplemental educational services	70457
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 72311099
Comments:	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	848489	761525	89.8	86964	10.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	103825	94211	90.7	9614	9.3
Low-poverty schools	120015	106232	88.5	13783	11.5
All elementary schools	439576	402053	91.5	37523	8.5
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	71968	65655	91.2	6313	8.8
Low-poverty schools	74578	66796	89.6	7782	10.4
All secondary schools	408913	359472	87.9	49441	12.1

Comments: The exact wording for reporting of the data we use in the NCLB SPAR is "Percentage of Teachers that are NOT Highly Qualified".

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data in 1.5.1 are simply counts of the number of NCLB core courses records and does not consider periods, minutes, etc. So, if a single course record has a self-contained course for period range 1 - 6, then it counts once. If another district reports the same self-contained course, but sends 6 course records, one for each period, then it is counted 6 times.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	47.2
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	6.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.9
Other (please explain)	26.7
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	52.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.1
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)	36.4
Total	100.0
Comments: Other represents a variety of reasons elementary and secondary teachers are not highly qualified.	

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	74.0	32.0
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free/reduced price lunch	
Secondary schools	58.0	22.0
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free/reduced price lunch	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
22	Dual language	Spanish, Haitian-Creole, Vietnamese, Portuguese, and French	50.0	50.0
0	Two-way immersion			
7	Transitional bilingual	Spanish, Haitian-Creole, Vietnamese, Portuguese, and French	60.0	40.0
22	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Haitian-Creole, Vietnamese, Portuguese, and French	50.0	50.0
0	Heritage language			
7	Sheltered English instruction			
48	Structured English immersion			
48	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
48	Content-based ESL			
0	Pull-out ESL			
0	Other (explain)			

Comments: There are 67 school districts and 7 special schools that are counted as school districts for a total of 74 school districts in Florida. In 2006-07, 48 of the 74 school districts were eligible for Title III funding.

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

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	141725
Comments: Florida funds instructional services to ELLs; 1.6.2.1 requested data only on Title III funded students and 1.6.3.1.1 requested data on ALL students, regardless of funding source.	

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

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

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	196034
Haitian-Creole	25822
Portuguese	3676
Vietnamese	2710
French	1949

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Arabic - 1,816; Chinese,Zhongwen - 1,551; Russian - 1,136
--

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	224379
Not tested/State annual ELP	6583
Subtotal	230962
LEP/One Data Point	15257
Comments: Florida funds instructional services to ELLs; 1.6.2.1 requested data only on Title III funded students and 1.6.3.1.1 requested data on ALL students, regardless of funding source.	

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

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

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	224379
Not tested/State annual ELP	6583
Subtotal	230962
LEP/One Data Point	15257
Comments: NOTE: Designation of whether or not students were served by Title III funded programs was not collected at the time of testing. Florida tested all students, regardless of whether district received Title III funds or not. As of July 1, 2007, a new data element was implemented to collect this. Update to CSPR Will be submitted as part of Florida's Response to Attachment T with additional explanation.	

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

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

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

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

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: No data are reported because proficiency on Florida's assessment (CELLA) has not yet been determined.				

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: No data are reported because CELLA cut scores are scheduled to be presented to the State Board in April 2008. Florida will report AMAO targets and determinations in July 2008, per approved corrective action plan.				

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

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

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	#
Total MFLEP	74089
MFLEP/AYP grades	50678
Comments: Note 1.6.3.4.3 requested data on all MFLEP and 1.6.3.6.2 requests data on MFLEP in AYP grades in math.	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	441113
LEP HS/Non-AYP	25327
LEP other grades	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
Comments: Florida does not offer Native Language Assessments.	

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: Florida does not offer Native Language Assessments.	

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

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

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: Florida does not offer Native Language Assessments.	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: Florida does not offer Native Language Assessments.		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: Florida does not offer Native Language Assessments.		

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
78203	78184	156387
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
53530	31942	59.7	

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

Comments: Note 1.6.3.4.3 requested data on all MFLEP and 1.6.3.6.2 requests data on MFLEP in AYP grades in math.

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
53623	28995	54.1	

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

Comments: Note 1.6.3.4.3 requested data on all MFLEP and 1.6.3.6.2 requests data on MFLEP in AYP grades in math.

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

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

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

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

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	48
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	48
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	48
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	
Comments: Florida has administered CELLA (ELP Statewide Assessment) for two consecutive years and is in the process of completing the standard setting process. We will submit an updated report including 2005 - 06 and 2006 - 07 AMAOs (Making Progress and Attaining Proficiency) upon completion of standard setting and also as a supplement to Attachment T response.	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
143353	143353	48

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	48327
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	49085
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	2454

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

Comments: Additional certified teachers were calculated as a percentage based on growth in ELL population.

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	48	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	48	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	48	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	48	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	48	
Other (Explain in comment box)	48	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community-based organization personnel		
Total		
Comments: As noted previously, data not collected in 2006-07. Florida implemented a new data element to collect this data effective July 1, 2007.		

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/15/06	9/11/06	56
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

On-line application, with approvable sample sections, are provided to school districts to expedite the submission of approvable applications. Additionally, focused technical assistance is provided to districts based on size and similar demographics. NOTE: In Florida, funds are distributed as Federal Cash Advanced, based on when districts submit requests for downloading funds; this is often done by the local budget office, and expenditures from various federal grants are reported at the same time.

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

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	68.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	73.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	52.8
Hispanic	61.2
White, non-Hispanic	77.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	37.4
Limited English proficient	46.3
Economically disadvantaged	53.6
Migratory students	42.9
Male	64.2
Female	72.5
Comments:	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4.7
Hispanic	3.9
White, non-Hispanic	2.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.6
Limited English proficient	5.3
Economically disadvantaged	4.1
Migratory students	4.8
Male	1.7
Female	2.9
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	34	34
LEAs with subgrants	33	33
Total	67	67
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	25	573
K	242	2791
1	231	2974
2	213	2771
3	182	2714
4	167	2385
5	136	2315
6	139	2335
7	137	2054
8	134	2096
9	103	2246
10	70	1480
11	45	1056
12	66	874
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1890	28664
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	461	7472
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1187	14962
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	89	817
Hotels/Motels	147	2877
Total	1884	26128
Comments: Table above does not include 7 Homeless children in LEAs WITHOUT Subgrants that have unknown primary nighttime residency codes. It also does not include 1963 Homeless children in LEAs WITH Subgrants that have unknown primary nighttime residency codes. - CSPR did not allow us to enter "unknown" primary nighttime residence students. Since "unknown" was not a category on CSPR, they weren't included on the totals; the totals for this section do not match other totals.		

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

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	2791
1	2974
2	2771
3	2714
4	2385
5	2315
6	2335
7	2054
8	2096
9	2246
10	1480
11	1056
12	874
Ungraded	0
Total	28091
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	4437
Migratory children/youth	925
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6008
Limit English proficient students	2831
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	32
2. Expedited evaluations	23
3. Staff professional development and awareness	33
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	30
5. Transportation	26
6. Early childhood programs	15
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	29
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	27
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	30
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	32
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	32
12. Counseling	21
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	27
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	27
15. School supplies	32
16. Referral to other programs and services	31
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	30
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	5
2. School Selection	3
3. Transportation	10
4. School records	4
5. Immunizations	5
6. Other medical records	8
7. Other Barriers	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	2314	1248
4	2012	956
5	1939	653
6	1924	486
7	1576	517
8	1638	623
High School	2402	916
Comments: We were mistaken that the non-full year students were not included in 1.2.1 and 1.2.3. The data in 1.9.2.5.1 and 1.9.2.5.2 was resubmitted on 2/14/08 and contains non-full year students.		

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

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	2311	1177
4	1992	987
5	1942	964
6	1936	728
7	1572	648
8	1657	426
High School	2419	434
Comments: We were mistaken that the non-full year students were not included in 1.2.1 and 1.2.3. The data in 1.9.2.5.1 and 1.9.2.5.2 was resubmitted on 2/14/08 and contains non-full year students.		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4782
K	2666
1	2603
2	2356
3	2225
4	2107
5	1914
6	1999
7	1636
8	1907
9	2184
10	1739
11	1569
12	1670
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	6019
Total	37376
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The significant changes reflected in the numbers being reported for both Category I and Category II can be attributed to the following factors:

the on-going efforts of the State and its sub-grantees to ensure that the children receiving services via Migrant Education Programs are eligible to receive these services;

the end of eligibility for a number of families;

the impact of Immigration Reform issues on new families;

the loss of significant farmland to industrial development; and

an over-all reduction in the number of students enrolling in schools for

the 2006-07 school year.

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

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1204
K	973
1	1053
2	1008
3	881
4	814
5	734
6	666
7	472
8	615
9	687
10	559
11	456
12	221
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	468
Total	10811
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The significant changes reflected in the numbers being reported for both Category I and Category II can be attributed to the following factors:

the on-going efforts of the State and its sub-grantees to ensure that the children receiving services via Migrant Education Programs are eligible to receive these services;

the end of eligibility for a number of families;

the impact of Immigration Reform issues on new families;

the loss of significant farmland to industrial development; and

an over-all reduction in the number of students enrolling in schools for

the 2006-07 school year.

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

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All local student data is transmitted to the State via an automated Management Information System (MIS): the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System. The data are collected by the school districts through their local systems, and submitted to the state at pre-set times throughout the year, with a nine-month window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. The districts use this same system to transmit the data that are used to calculate the migrant count. This years' count was obtained using the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System using data submitted by the districts in August, 2007 via Survey 5, with updates and corrections up to October 12, 2007. Survey 5 differs from all other surveys in that it is a cumulative count of all students served in all programs during the preceding school year, and therefore captures all migrant students.

Last year's child counts were generated using the same system. In 2002, a data element was added to the Florida Student Information Data Base system: the Migrant Status Term, Student Demographic Reporting Format. This data element uses a coding system to indicate whether the migrant child was served in regular term (3), summer term (S), or both (B). A separate code (Code X) is used to identify students who qualified as migrants, but received no services (neither academic nor support services; in regular or summer term). In 2006, the coding used to indicate that the migrant child was served in the regular term (3) was revised to reflect that the migrant child was enrolled/served--with services provided during the regular school day--(D) or that the migrant child was enrolled/served --with some or all services provided during extended day/week--(E). Extensive technical assistance was provided to school districts to ensure the accuracy of this coding system, including regional workshops and presentations at Florida's annual Information Database Workshop held in June each year.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff (recruiters/advocates/liaisons) identify eligible migrant children through face-to-face interviews and document their eligibility using a state approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. This form captures all the necessary data for identification and reporting: student name, parent names, Qualifying Arrival Date, TO/FROM city and state, date of birth, gender, race/ethnicity, country of birth, current school enrollment, etc.

Florida's guidelines require district MEPs to generate a new COE each time a migrant child makes a new qualifying move. In addition, district MEP staff is required to annually contact the child or the child's parent/guardian in order to update the child's COE. Documentation of this process is maintained at the district-level. District MEP staff is trained to verify the information on the COE, and enter it into the local Management Information Services (MIS) data bases. The school districts transmit the student-level data from their local systems to Florida's Automated Student Data Base System via Survey 5. A complete description of the system used, along with a complete layout of the data elements, may be found at: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/student_0607.asp

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) staff conducts annual on-site reviews that include re-interviewing selected families, to ensure that the information on the COEs is accurate and that the children on the COE are eligible to receive Migrant Education Program services.

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

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

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data from hard copies of the COE are inputted into district Management Information Services (MIS) databases by MEP data entry personnel via input portals at the Migrant Education Program offices. COE information is not completed electronically in the field. Summer/inter-session program data is also input in the same manner. Summer/inter-session program information is retrieved from detailed logs that identify the children that were served, services provided, duration of the programs, and program outcomes. Such logs are retained in the district MEP offices and provide the data for completing a summer program outcome report that is submitted to the State Migrant Education Program at the conclusion of a summer program. All of these data are transmitted electronically during the required survey period through Florida's Automated Student Information Database System. The Student Demographic Format collects student-level data on all students in Florida, including but not limited to: date of Birth, Qualifying Arrival Date, Country of Birth, and other information about services provided to migrant students. To obtain a student count, the database is queried for all children meeting the criteria for current migrant status in regular and summer categories.

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.

Same processes used to collect and maintain the State's Category 2 count.

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

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The database is queried for all children between the ages of 3 and 22 (Date of Birth range of 9/2/84 through 8/31/04, inclusive, which captures those who were 2 and turned 3 and those who were 21 and turned 22), whose Qualifying Arrival Date is greater than 8/31/03, with a valid Migrant Status Term Code, and an appropriate service for Summer Session. This process is applied to all students that are identified as migrant in the state student database. The students are then sorted by Category I or II using the Migrant Status Term data element. Edit checks for both Category 1 and Category II are performed on the data file generated by this query to delete children who may be included in error.

These edits include identifying children who have been coded receiving a diploma from one of four prescribed categories (Standard Diplomas, Certificates of Completion, Special Diplomas and State of Florida Diploma), and excluding or removing these children from the data file. Additionally, edits to the file identify children who have turned 22 prior to the beginning of the reporting period (9/1/06 through 8/31/07). These edits are shared with the district Migrant Education Program staff that are required to revise the migrant code in the district student data base to identify the student as a non-migrant student.

The file is then shared with district MEP and Management Information Services (MIS) Departments to verify their data. Districts are provided a reasonable time to make corrections as needed before the revised data are extracted once more. With regard to verifying that those children whose 3rd birthday occurs during the eligibility period are still resident in the State before including them in the child count; on-site monitoring (conducted by State MEP staff) of basic district level quality control procedures being implemented document a standard practice among district MEPs. It is a standard procedure that children who will turn 3 during the eligibility period are flagged by the data clerk (whose responsibility it is to input student data into district data base) at the beginning of each school year or at the time of interview or re-interview of a family. Before data is submitted for the reporting period (Survey 5), data clerks confer with recruiters to ensure that these children/families are still in the district.

Since Survey 5 data are cumulative for the entire school year; all children meeting the eligibility requirements are captured, regardless of their length of stay. The data element Migrant Status Term identifies which term(s) a migratory child was served and/or identified. Further, migratory children selected for inclusion in the count from the State Student Data Base had to have had a Qualifying Arrival Date greater than 8/31/03. State Student Data Base reporting procedures require that any migrant child, who had graduated at the end of the regular school year, would not have a record in the student data base indicating summer term participation. FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "continuation of services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations.

In addition to the Migrant Status Term contained in the Student Demographic Format, data elements in the Federal/State Compensatory Evaluation Format provide information regarding summer services to migrant students. The summer school code cannot be entered for a student without a link to a code for summer services. Each year, a comprehensive presentation is made at the State Data Base Workshop. This presentation targets migrant staff, data clerks, and Information Technology (IT) staff and covers all reporting requirements for migrant students and migrant program data. When the specific Migrant Status Term data element was created, very explicit definitions were developed and disseminated to MEP/IT staff. Two of the codes were created to identify students who received services during the summer. The codes are "B"â€students who were served in both the regular 180 day school year AND the summer term and "S"â€students that were served only in the summer term. Summer programs and services that are funded partially or fully by migrant program funds are clearly highlighted in district Migrant Education Program Project applications and are corroborated by district logs that provide the data for completing a summer program outcome report that is submitted to the State Migrant Education Program at the conclusion of the program. Districts have been provided guidance clarifying that children who receive instructional packets as a one-time act of providing instructional or support services cannot be included in their "summer count."

All students in Florida are assigned a unique, ten-digit Student Identification (SID) number consisting of the student's Social Security number followed by an 'X'. Those without Social Security numbers are assigned a SID by the local school district using a state defined methodology, which then becomes the student's State SID. Should a student move, the receiving district is required to search the State's Student Locator system to determine if the student had prior enrollment history in any of Florida's public schools. If so, the SID which was originally coded as the student's SID is to be assigned to the student in the receiving district. Please refer

to: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0607/st262_1.pdf.

For this year's count, the following process was used: A master file containing all the students in the state was generated and the students that met the federal criteria were coded as 'Migrant'. A separate data file containing only migrant students served in Regular and Summer Sessions was generated. All records were matched and (unduplicated) by data element fields Term, SID, District Number and School Number. Because of the uniqueness of each students' SID (a process that is clearly defined in Florida's Information Data Base Manuals and overseen by FDOE in district Data Quality Reviews) there is an assurance that data are unique for each student, based upon the data element Student Number Identifier Florida and Migrant Status Term. By using the SID and Migrant Status Term and matching for duplicate SIDs this methodology insures the data tables produce an unduplicated count for each session. When students are initially enrolled by district data staff, THEY must ensure that if a pre-existing SID is selected for a student, it must match on all variables, i.e.; name, DOB, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, home language, and parent names at a minimum before assigning a new SID.

To further ensure an unduplicated migrant child count, state MEP data staff utilized the initial list of unduplicated migrant children to generate several lists of potential duplicates with a specified number of matching data fields (such as date of birth and last name or date of birth and parent name). The records of these children were examined individually. Those records that appeared to be duplicated were resolved with the districts. An additional measure to ensure that districts do not generate a new SID for a student with an existing SID will be to disseminate extensive guidance to district MEP and district data staff (via a Technical Assistance Document) on the nuances of Hispanic names and strongly encourage an in-depth probe of the State Student Locator system to identify such students before a new SID is issued. Presently, if a student with the name of Frank Gonzales and another with Francisco Gonzales matched on all other variables such as date of birth and last name or date of birth and parent name, these student records would be considered potential duplicates and referred to the district MEP for resolution.

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.

Same processes used to generate State's Category 2 count.

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

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on the recommendations of the 2005 Re-interview initiative, FLDOE established (2006) the Florida Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Office and hired a state ID&R Coordinator and a trainer. These persons are responsible for providing technical assistance and training to LEAs on procedures and guidelines for eligibility, identification and recruitment, updating the procedures and forms (COEs) used by recruiters to meet accepted practices, and resolving questionable eligibility information on the COE forms with district ME staff and other credible sources. The ID&R office also has updated the Florida ID&R Manual, modified the COE, provided new instructions for appropriate COE completion, and met with stakeholders and practitioners to develop and recommend eligibility policy to be accepted by the state.

The local educational agencies have the responsibility of following the procedures and practices contained in the Florida ID&R Manual, developing a local Quality Control Plan, ensuring that staff is aware of the local Quality Control Plan, as well as the procedures and guidelines for ID&R in Florida, and participating in workshops and/or conferences conducted or sponsored by the SEA and/or the ID&R Office.

A new COE is generated for any new migrant child and existing COEs are updated annually for continued residency and age eligibility. Technical assistance is provided by the staff in the Title I Programs and Academic Intervention Services Office or the ID&R Office, specializing in identification and recruitment procedures and practices to district and school-level migrant staff. Selected district MEPs are visited to ensure that the COEs are properly completed, reflect valid eligibility determinations and are submitted to local MIS offices for transmission to the State in a timely manner. This practice has been incorporated in annual, pre-scheduled monitoring activities for all Federal Programs, but remains a stand alone activity for MEP Programs (at the discretion of the State) in districts that may not be targeted for monitoring. The following Quality Control Procedures incorporates the steps the State will take to ensure the integrity of eligibility determinations by district MEPs and the accuracy of migrant child data collected and submitted as well as to address the outcomes of the Re-Interviewing Initiative:

- a. The initial eligibility determination of a student is made through face-to-face interviews with a parent, guardian, other responsible adult or an out of school youth traveling on his/her own.
- b. The SEA provides state-wide Identification and Recruitment training at least once a year, more frequently to individual districts by request or by triggers that may surface during the annual district COE review. During these trainings, MEP definitions, interviewing skills, COE completion and quality control training are provided to enhance the level of knowledge of veteran and new staff. This year, FLDOE and the ID&R Office conducted 5 regional training events scheduled throughout the state (April 10-19, 2007) to discuss the basic core of eligibility requirements, implementation of a recruiter's code of ethics, update on migrant policy from the state, and review of the ID&R handbook. In addition, training and guidance was provided at the State Migrant Education Conferences in December 2006 and October 2007. During the state conference, recruitment staff was trained on the basics of eligibility determinations, interview skills, quality control and other ID&R related topics.
- c. Florida utilizes a Steering Committee and a Policy Work Group comprised of state and local MEP administrators, recruiters, advocates and other stakeholders, to assist in drafting guidance/policy regarding program implementation procedures and practices with particular emphasis on researching and collecting data to address Florida-specific grey issues on eligibility and qualifying activities. Draft guidance will be presented to the Office of Migrant Education (OME) for review and consensus before being distributed to district MEPs for implementation.
- d. Florida, in collaboration with the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT) and the ID&R Office, has revised their Identification and Recruitment Handbook. The SEA has distributed a near final copy to districts and stakeholders for their final review. The districts and their staff will have until January 9, 2008, to provide input. After the feedback is reviewed, the manual will be finalized. Though the Florida ID&R handbook is nearly completed, the Florida MEP has ensured that every MEP staff person has in their possession a copy of the current Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance and other pertinent documents. MEP staff are expected to follow the guidelines of the draft NRG along with all other guidance as disseminated by the Florida MEP.
- e. The COE was modified to facilitate the collection of information by recruiters and to align the items with similar forms used in other states. The form includes items and instructions related to issues such as "to seek", FERPA and Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL). The Policy Group will convene in early 2008 to review the latest form and recommend additional changes.
- f. The proper chain of command for resolving eligibility issues is that the recruiter brings the issue to local MEP staff and the Coordinator; if the issue is still unclear, the Coordinator can refer the issue to the state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. The state ID&R coordinator will research for similar situations and prior determinations that may facilitate a decision. Also, the ID&R

coordinator will contact other districts as well as practitioners in other states who, in a confidential manner, will provide feedback. If a clear determination cannot be made, the issue is submitted to the Office of Migrant Education (OME). When possible, the FL-MEP will include the state's position or recommendation in the issue. The consensus of OME is shared with all local MEP staff.

g. It is a standard operating procedure to verify the migrant child data extracted from the State student database with the migrant student data submitted at the district level. Files of these data are provided to districts for that purpose. Windows of opportunities to correct/revise/delete migrant child records are given to district MEPs to ensure that all students captured for state funding purposes are eligible migrant children.

h. A monthly e-newsletter is sent to recruitment staff across the state. Through the newsletter, recruiters and other migrant staff are kept informed of eligibility and policy guidance affecting the state. Also, the newsletter provides information in upcoming training events, and has a monthly "Question of the Month" for recruiters regarding key eligibility issues. Currently, there are over 225 migrant personnel registered to receive the newsletter.

i. The Florida ID&R Office developed a code of ethics for recruiters and recruitment staff. The purpose of the code is to provide recruiters with the minimum expectations and responsibilities associated with the MEP. The code is to be reviewed every year to incorporate changes based in current issues affecting recruiters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Upon submission of the 2006 Re-Interview Initiative Report, the FLDOE began the process of implementing the corrective actions described therein. The state has conducted statewide and regional training activities with recruitment staff regarding making proper eligibility determinations. In addition, LEAs were trained on how to corroborate information provided by families on the COEs. A state ID&R manual is nearly completed and a quality control assurances document is being developed. An ID&R Office established and staff was hired to deal specifically with recruitment issues throughout the state. Significant changes to the COE were implemented, and key stakeholders were involved in recommending policy and guidance regarding eligibility to the state.

At the local level, key corrective actions have been implemented as well. Many LEAs have initiated local re-interview processes using the protocols and forms developed by the state. The districts conduct re-interviews on an ongoing basis to validate eligibility determinations, particularly in situations where there is recently hired staff and unusual eligibility circumstances. The districts make sure that recruitment staff participates in all ID&R-related training provided by the state. In addition, the LEAs are currently compiling and updating a list of the major qualifying activities in their area.

The districts also communicate, on a regular basis, with the ID&R office to discuss eligibility questions and review particular cases. Based on the number of questions received and the content of such questions, the ID&R Office provides guidance, through the e-newsletter, to clarify any ongoing issues related to eligibility determinations. In addition, the ID&R Office continuously schedules training with new staff at the districts.

Large scale state-wide re-interviewing has not taken place at the time of this report. The ID&R Office has been charged with developing the state-wide plan for re-interviewing eligibility determinations. The plan is in the final stages of development and will be rolled out by February of 2008.

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

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The revised data element allows FDOE to produce preliminary reports and distribute these to school districts for further verification. Also, each District Migrant Coordinator is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the electronic records match the information on the COEs before the records are transmitted electronically to the State.

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

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following verification process was used: A file broken down by LEA/district level containing student counts of all students reported in the data element Migrant Status Term code was sent to both MEP and MIS staff in each district on August 20, 2007. Districts had until October 12, 2007 to verify this data and submit any corrections to the SEA.

Districts were to use the file to verify the accuracy of data coded into the state student data base system. Both the District Migrant Coordinator and District MIS Directors were provided with these data files. FLDOE advised all district MEP and MIS staff to work collaboratively to ensure that the student counts were accurate, unduplicated and that each student record met the No Child Left Behind Act definition of a migrant student. School districts were allowed to make updates to their data up to the last possible moment to ensure the greatest degree of accuracy possible. Analysts in the Department then produced the final migrant student count using the data set/file containing all corrections made by school districts during the verification phase.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The FLDOE and the ID&R Office will develop and implement a detailed plan for conducting random re-interviews of migrant families throughout the state beginning February 2008. Continuous training will be provided to district Migrant Education Program staff on all facets of identification and recruitment of migratory families that will include reiterating interview techniques designed to assist recruitment staff in making viable eligibility determinations. District MEPs will be encouraged to maintain their local efforts to verify eligibility determinations by re-interviewing selected families. The FLDOE, in conjunction with the office of Education Information and Accountability Services (EIAS), will continue to modify migrant data elements to ensure that migrant children are properly identified and reported in the state student data base.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The FLDOE Migrant Education Program is assured of the accuracy of the migrant child counts reported for Fiscal Year 2006-2007.

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

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