CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

NEW MEXICO

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
New Mexico Public Education Department

Address:
300 Don Gaspar Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Sam Ornelas

Telephone: 505-222-4740

Fax: 505-222-4759

e-mail: sam.ornelas@state.nm.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Sam Ornelas

_____   __Friday, March 7, 2008, 6:07:39 PM__
    Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New Mexico is participating in the American Diploma Project (ADP). As part of that project we are aligning our 9-12 Math and Reading/Language Arts Standards with the ADP Benchmarks for College and Workplace Readiness. The revised Math Standards have been submitted for Quality Review II. A response is expected in January and a final decision in March. The Reading/Language Arts Standards have been through Quality Review I and further revisions will be submitted for Quality Review II by April 30, 2008.

Revisions to the K-8 Math Standards are under review as to the impact they would have on the current Standards-Based Assessment. A decision on whether to proceed with the revisions is expected in January 2008.

No revisions or changes to Science content standards taken or planned at this time, but it is understood that ADP may have Science Benchmarks in the future that will lead to such a revision.

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Grade 9 will not be assessed for either Reading or Math in 2008. There is a state-mandated High School Redesign initiative as well as the American Diploma Project (ADP)proposed revisions that will affect subject areas tested and grades tested projected in 2009 at the earliest. We are examining the possibility of moving the Standards Based Assessment for HS from grade 11 to grade 10.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Science has been implemented in grades 3-8 since 2005, and grade 11 becomes operational in 2008. There is a trans adapted version of Science in Spanish that has been operational as above. Science has been implemented in the Alternate Assessment beginning in 2007.

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.

Academic Achievement Standards in Science have been implemented since operational 2005 for grades 3-8. Grade 11 achievement standards are being established for Grade 11 in 2008. Achievement standards for the alternate assessment are in place.

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	194174	194077	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	21357	21356	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2518	2518	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4957	4955	100.0
Hispanic	105918	105891	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	59393	59343	99.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27124	27094	99.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	30376	30372	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	121409	121373	100.0
Migratory students	563	563	100.0
Male	98957	98912	100.0
Female	95200	95165	100.0

Comments: Reasons for counts being different between 1.2.1 and 1.3.1

1) For high school, grades 9 and 11 were reported in EDEN file N081. For section 1.3.1 we received verbal instructions to use only one grade. Grade 11 was used.

2) The counts that were reported in EDEN file N081 reflect the enrollment at the time of the tests, whether the students successfully completed the Standards Based Assessment or not. (N081: "This file specification collects the number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state NCLB assessments by whether the students participated or did not participate in the state assessment.") The numbers reported in 1.3.1 are "Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned". These counts are not the same set. Some student tests were invalidated because of testing irregularities, parental refusal, or other non completion. These students were included in the counts in N081, but were not in the counts of proficiency in 1.3.1.

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

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13077	44.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14248	48.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1816	6.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	29141	

Comments: Reasons for counts being different:

1) For high school, grades 9 and 11 were reported in EDEN file N081. For section 1.3.1 we received verbal instructions to use only one grade. Grade 11 was used.

2) The counts that were reported in EDEN file N081 reflect the enrollment at the time of the tests, whether the students successfully completed the Standards Based Assessment or not (N081: "This file specification collects the number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state NCLB assessments by whether the students participated or did not participate in the state assessment. ") The numbers reported in 1.3.1 are "Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned". These counts are not the same set. Some student tests were invalidated because of testing irregularities, parental refusal, or other non completion. These students were included in the counts in N081, but were not in the counts of proficiency in 1.3.1.

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	194129	194032	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	21371	21370	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2500	2500	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4955	4953	100.0
Hispanic	105887	105859	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	59386	59337	99.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	27129	27099	99.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	30332	30328	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	121371	121336	100.0
Migratory students	560	560	100.0
Male	98930	98885	100.0
Female	95182	95147	100.0

Comments: Reasons for counts being different:

1) For high school, grades 9 and 11 were reported in EDEN N081. For section 1.3.2 we received verbal instructions to use only one grade. Grade 11 was used.

2) The counts that were reported in EDEN file N081 reflect the enrollment at the time of the tests, whether the students successfully completed the Standards Based Assessment or not (N081: "This file specification collects the number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state NCLB assessments by whether the students participated or did not participate in the state assessment. ") The numbers reported in 1.3.2 are "Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned". These counts are not the same set. Some student tests were invalidated because of testing irregularities, parental refusal, or other non completion. These students were included in the counts in N081, but were not in the counts of proficiency in 1.3.2.

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	9628	37.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14252	55.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1804	7.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	25684	

Comments: Reasons for counts being different:

1)For high school, grades 9 and 11 were reported in EDEN N081. For section 1.3.2 we received verbal instructions to use only one grade. Grade 11 was used.

2) The counts that were reported in EDEN file N081 reflect the enrollment at the time of the tests, whether the students successfully completed the Standards Based Assessment or not (N081: "This file specification collects the number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state NCLB assessments by whether the students participated or did not participate in the state assessment. ") The numbers reported in 1.3.2 are "Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned". These counts are not the same set. Some student tests were invalidated because of testing irregularities, parental refusal, or other non completion. These students were included in the counts in N081, but were not in the counts of proficiency in 1.3.2.

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 <u>not</u> 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	24236	10597	43.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2360	633	26.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	346	207	59.8
Black, non-Hispanic	621	201	32.4
Hispanic	13864	5473	39.5
White, non-Hispanic	7041	4083	58.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3245	748	23.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4536	1579	34.8
Economically disadvantaged students	16782	6183	36.8
Migratory students	83	33	39.8
Male	12372	5424	43.8
Female	11861	5173	43.6
Comments: All flagged data warnings were verified.			

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	24220	13154	54.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2363	915	38.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	344	238	69.2
Black, non-Hispanic	617	304	49.3
Hispanic	13852	6770	48.9
White, non-Hispanic	7042	4925	69.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3240	802	24.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4527	1544	34.1
Economically disadvantaged students	16772	7813	46.6
Migratory students	82	28	34.1
Male	12359	6131	49.6
Female	11858	7021	59.2
Comments: All data were verified.			

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	24155	11112	46.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2332	728	31.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	384	280	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	621	233	37.5
Hispanic	13624	5408	39.7
White, non-Hispanic	7189	4460	62.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3260	713	21.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4482	1132	25.3
Economically disadvantaged students	16335	6144	37.6
Migratory students	52	13	25.0
Male	12342	5632	45.6
Female	11813	5480	46.4
Comments: All figures verified.			

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	24150	13247	54.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2329	903	38.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	382	288	75.4
Black, non-Hispanic	618	295	47.7
Hispanic	13626	6652	48.8
White, non-Hispanic	7190	5105	71.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3259	769	23.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4475	1315	29.4
Economically disadvantaged students	16328	7527	46.1
Migratory students	52	15	28.8
Male	12334	6137	49.8
Female	11816	7110	60.2
Comments: All figures were verified.			

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	23928	8731	36.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2370	566	23.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	330	212	64.2
Black, non-Hispanic	661	177	26.8
Hispanic	13412	3952	29.5
White, non-Hispanic	7155	3824	53.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3271	397	12.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4295	647	15.1
Economically disadvantaged students	16226	4536	28.0
Migratory students	74	11	14.9
Male	12081	4370	36.2
Female	11847	4361	36.8
Comments: All data verified.			

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	23893	14224	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2370	997	42.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	326	264	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	658	380	57.8
Hispanic	13386	7205	53.8
White, non-Hispanic	7153	5378	75.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3260	701	21.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4279	1304	30.5
Economically disadvantaged students	16203	8317	51.3
Migratory students	74	28	37.8
Male	12054	6470	53.7
Female	11839	7754	65.5
Comments: All data verified.			

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	23990	6432	26.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2429	377	15.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	152	52.4
Black, non-Hispanic	623	112	18.0
Hispanic	13429	2706	20.2
White, non-Hispanic	7216	3084	42.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3400	303	8.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3693	294	8.0
Economically disadvantaged students	15590	2798	17.9
Migratory students	77	<N	
Male	12278	3334	27.2
Female	11710	3097	26.4
Comments: All data verified.			

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	24000	8979	37.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2434	476	19.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	288	165	57.3
Black, non-Hispanic	625	192	30.7
Hispanic	13432	4184	31.1
White, non-Hispanic	7218	3960	54.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3395	382	11.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3692	512	13.9
Economically disadvantaged students	15602	4422	28.3
Migratory students	77	30	39.0
Male	12277	3952	32.2
Female	11721	5026	42.9
Comments: All data verified.			

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	24499	6178	25.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2782	385	13.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	279	152	54.5
Black, non-Hispanic	645	123	19.1
Hispanic	13411	2503	18.7
White, non-Hispanic	7379	3014	40.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3399	233	6.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3979	269	6.8
Economically disadvantaged students	15483	2553	16.5
Migratory students	65	13	20.0
Male	12525	3101	24.8
Female	11974	3077	25.7
Comments: All data verified.			

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	24451	12356	50.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2783	943	33.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	274	194	70.8
Black, non-Hispanic	645	309	47.9
Hispanic	13368	5983	44.8
White, non-Hispanic	7378	4926	66.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3401	517	15.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3982	1008	25.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15453	6383	41.3
Migratory students	65	31	47.7
Male	12493	5694	45.6
Female	11958	6662	55.7
Comments: All Data Verified.			

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	24895	7527	30.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2860	504	17.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	298	178	59.7
Black, non-Hispanic	611	138	22.6
Hispanic	13475	3036	22.5
White, non-Hispanic	7644	3671	48.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3532	240	6.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3403	293	8.6
Economically disadvantaged students	15578	3142	20.2
Migratory students	62	<N	
Male	12740	3752	29.5
Female	12150	3775	31.1
Comments: All data verified.			

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	24894	13998	56.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2863	1112	38.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	297	217	73.1
Black, non-Hispanic	610	313	51.3
Hispanic	13477	6843	50.8
White, non-Hispanic	7641	5512	72.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3529	616	17.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3406	930	27.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15575	7331	47.1
Migratory students	62	25	40.3
Male	12753	6492	50.9
Female	12137	7505	61.8
Comments: All data verified			

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	19395	6213	32.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2491	403	16.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	284	165	58.1
Black, non-Hispanic	480	101	21.0
Hispanic	9246	2051	22.2
White, non-Hispanic	6893	3493	50.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2466	164	6.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2053	121	5.9
Economically disadvantaged students	9131	1778	19.5
Migratory students	40	<N	
Male	9595	3194	33.3
Female	9797	3019	30.8
Comments: All data verified.			

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	19486	9434	48.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2492	802	32.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	282	168	59.6
Black, non-Hispanic	480	191	39.8
Hispanic	9317	3679	39.5
White, non-Hispanic	6914	4594	66.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2497	329	13.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2059	298	14.5
Economically disadvantaged students	9179	3378	36.8
Migratory students	39	14	35.9
Male	9640	4310	44.7
Female	9843	5124	52.1
Comments: All data verified.			

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	809	367	45.4
Districts	89	23	25.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	580	262	45.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	430	190	44.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	150	72	48.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
89	23	25.8
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All schools in School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring, and all districts that include such schools, receive services, either directly from PED or through other approaches, such as higher education, education service agencies, and other private providers. Responsibility for providing support to schools is divided between the SEA and the LEA, with increasingly direct SEA involvement as a school moves from "in need of improvement" status to "corrective action" status and then to "restructuring" status.

The implementation document for school improvement in New Mexico is the NMPED 2007-2008 School Improvement Framework. The document is aligned with, and reflects, priorities established by NCLB and New Mexico statutes.

New Mexico currently has four (4) Regional Quality Centers (RQCs). The Public Education Department provides funding for these centers and works closely with them by providing technical assistance and professional development both to the schools served by the centers and to the centers themselves.

The Public Education Department has established a system of Technical Assistance Teams, Technical Assistance Coaches, and Technical Assistance Consultants to provide support and assistance to schools in their first, second and third year of corrective action (NM designations CA, R1 and R2).

Technical Assistance Teams are composed of an Education Administrator from the Priority Schools Bureau (Team Lead) and at least two Education Administrators from other PED departments (Team Members). These teams conduct comprehensive needs assessment and system evaluation visits at all schools with an R-1 designation (25 schools, including one that made AYP this year and is therefore in a "delayed" status). During the ensuing school year, each school receives three follow-up visits for the purpose of monitoring progress and providing additional support from one of the team members or the team lead.

Technical Assistance Coaches are Education Administrators from PED. Each coach visits an R-2 school (63 schools, including five that are in "delayed" status) to provide support and recommendations for the implementation of the school's approved EPSS.

Technical Assistance Consultants are selected educators with skills and experience in school reform; in some instances, PED Education Administrators in the Priority Schools Bureau also act as Technical Assistance Consultants. They conduct needs assessment and systems evaluation visits to all schools with a Corrective Action designation (102 total, three of which made AYP this year and are in a "delayed" status), and report the results to PED.

Technical Assistance Team members receive quarterly trainings in aspects of technical assistance. All Team Members were also provided with eight days of training in cognitive coaching and additional training in the EPSS process and EPSS components.

All NM schools in corrective action or restructuring receive one of these Technical Assistance services; the type of service assigned is determined by the number of years the school has been in corrective action.

The most intensive service comes from Technical Assistance Teams. Schools are visited each quarter. During the first visit, the entire team conducts a school needs assessment, assists the school in developing a school improvement plan (Education Plan for Student Success, or EPSS), and provides both verbal and written feedback and recommendations. Subsequent visits are made to evaluate the degree of implementation of the EPSS and the effectiveness of the chosen strategies. The EPSS is revised during these visits according to the previous quarter's observed results.

In addition to these teams, the Public Education Department has contracted with America's Choice to provide thirty(30)Corrective or Restructuring schools with a comprehensive school reform program that includes core curricula in reading and math, interventions in reading and math, and training and coaching in effective instructional and classroom practices.

Both the PED teams and the America's Choice providers provide instructional program support and recommendations based on their observations and experience with the school.

It is generally the responsibility of the district to provide direct technical assistance to School Improvement schools (190 schools, 35 of which made AYP this year and are in "delayed" status); however, if such a school requests direct PED assistance the Priority Schools Bureau provides it either through a site visit or through written feedback.

In addition, the PED has signed Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) with six Regional Education Centers (RECs) to provide

training and support to School Improvement schools within their area of operations.

The PED requires reports from districts concerning the activities and status of their school improvement, corrective action and restructuring schools.

The Priority Schools Bureau reviews district and school EPSS plans to ensure alignment with requirements for the district and schools; written feedback is provided to the schools and the district.

Priority Schools Bureau administrators participate in the Spring Budget Review to ensure that budgets are aligned with improvement processes as detailed in the EPSS.

In addition, the PED provides a variety of trainings, workshops and conferences to assist schools and districts in developing improvement plans (the Education Plan for Student Success, or EPSS), in identifying areas for improvement, and in implementing and measuring strategies for improvement

The Priority Schools Bureau has developed a set of standards for effective schools and districts, together with a rubric, for schools and districts to use in evaluating the effectiveness of their organization and identifying areas for improvement.

School and district leadership of School Improvement and Corrective Action schools are invited to these; school and district leadership of Restructuring schools are required to participate in Regional Leadership Trainings in Reform Initiatives including but not limited to Baldrige systems alignment processes and using data to inform policy and program decisions, and to ensure that appropriate school leadership/goal teams participate in the Professional Development Institute for Educators.

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	3
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	25
Replacement of the principal	11
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
Comments: We include New Mexico categories "Corrective Action" and "Restructuring 1" in the above chart. "Restructuring 1" is the year in which the restructuring (Alternative Governance) plan is written; it is also the first year that the SEA takes significant direct action pre-empting some management authority at the school level.	

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	63
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 Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The PED identifies "Priority Districts" as those districts that:

o Did not meet AYP for the school year 2006-2007,

o Currently have a status of SI, SII, or Corrective Action (CA), and

o Have the highest concentration of CA, Restructuring I (RI) and Restructuring II (RII) schools in SY 2007-2008.

In 2006-2007 there were no districts in Corrective Action; PED is developing plans to address the achievement problems of any School Improvement districts that become CA districts.

All districts with schools in Corrective Action and Restructuring are provided with professional development in leadership, data use, strategic planning and systems thinking.

These districts are also required to participate in Technical Assistance Team visits to their schools during which the processes of needs assessment and strategic planning are modeled.

Districts are required to submit District EPSS plans for review and comment by PED. This process provides additional support and professional development about data analysis, needs analysis and strategic planning.

Finally, members of the Priority Schools Bureau participate in annual budget reviews for districts. Their role is to examine the proposed district budgets for alignment with improvement plans (EPSS) and with PED requirements.

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: There are no Corrective Action districts for the 2006-2007 school year. PED is in the process of developing a framework for addressing the problems of districts that move into Corrective Action.	

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

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

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	pending	9/20/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	12/21/07	8/3/07
Comments: District AYP has been delayed by a software issue. This timing is not typical.		

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	74	63
Comments: District Review and appeals are pending.		

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	pending

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.

Currently, the NMPED utilizes the Pyramid for School Support. The Framework for School Improvement (http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/index.html) was revised to align to a systemic approach to continuous improvement. The Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS), a strategic planning process and format, which all districts and schools must complete, follows the Plan, Do, Study, Act process with quarterly/triennial reporting of data to the district for S1 and S2 schools. Schools in CA report directly to the district and the district to the NMPED. Schools in R1 and R2 report both to the district and directly to PED.

The priorities of the State in allocating resources are:

1.Continue to provide customized technical assistance through school support teams.

2.Utilize research based strategies to change instructional practices.

3.Continue to develop partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and Education Partners through the schools support team process.

4.Continue to provide professional development for school support team members and other technical assistance team providers.

The Section 1003a funding supports these priorities by allowing the SEA to contract with a provider of a strong school reform model incorporating customized technical assistance, research based strategies and materials, and appropriate professional development and coaching.

Allocation of the support made possible by the Section 1003 funding is based on a combination of several priorities, including the specific needs of the school, the expected impact of the support, and the capacity of the school to implement a full-scale reform model. We have refrained from using a "one size fits all" approach and the distribution of the support is balanced among School Improvement schools and Corrective Action/Restructuring schools.

Utilizing Section 1003a funding, we currently provide schools with continued support in the systemic reform model America's Choice. This model provides a leadership component, ELL component, reading core, math core, reading interventions, math interventions, and ongoing professional development / coaching. This model was selected by a review committee based on criteria outlined in an RFP for systemic reform models. The research on this model was the most effective for assisting schools in addressing a systemic approach to academic achievement. This school improvement strategy was selected because it provides a systemic approach to school improvement.

Of the thirty (30) schools receiving this support, eight (8) schools utilize state School Improvement Framework funding and twenty-two (22) schools utilize Section 1003a funding.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

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

	# Schools
Title I schools *from which* students transferred for public school choice	90
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	106
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	114025
Who applied to transfer	1903
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	1903

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response
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	$ 652276
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	29
Comments: LEAs were unable to provide School Choice due to reason 1, 2 and/ or 3.	

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	93
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	60175
Who applied for supplemental educational services	
Who received supplemental educational services	3825
Comments: The NMPED did not collect data for students who applied for SES, however we will be including it in our current reporting model.	

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	$ 4652666
Comments:	

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

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All schools	53155	48750	91.7	4405	8.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	3610	3387	93.8	223	6.2
Low-poverty schools	3551	3435	96.7	116	3.3
All elementary schools	14105	13178	93.4	927	6.6
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	7327	6656	90.8	671	9.2
Low-poverty schools	13686	12872	94.1	814	5.9
All secondary schools	39050	35572	91.1	3478	8.9
Comments:					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New Mexico counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	41.2
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	34.7
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	24.1
Other (please explain)	
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)	65.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	24.1
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	99.7	52.2
Poverty metric used	Eligibility for free/reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	99.0	40.8
Poverty metric used	Eligibility for free/reduced lunch	
Comments: The comment that was given for this section with the first version on the Data Verification was that "Poverty quartile breaks for high-poverty schools seem very high." To determine these values, I listed all 478 public and charter elementary schools in the state according to % students qualified for free and reduced lunch and sorted them from 100% to 0%. I then divided the list into quartiles. I did the same with the 334 secondary schools. For the elementary school, the school that was ranked at #119 had a free-reduced % of 99.71 and for secondary schools, the school at rank order #84 99.0%. So although the quartile breaks seem high for high poverty schools, the numbers fall into these quartile values.		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

1.6   TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	**OLOI**
14	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
14	Two-way immersion	Spanish	50.0	50.0
23	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	77.0	23.0
25	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Dine, Keres, Tiwa	77.0	23.0
23	Heritage language	Spanish, Dine, Keres, Jicarilla Apache, Tewa, Towa, and Zuni	77.0	23.0
3	Sheltered English instruction			
13	Structured English immersion			
4	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
14	Content-based ESL			
9	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			
Comments: The terms Dual language and Two-way immersion are used interchangeably.				

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

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	59937
Comments: The number of students that received Title III is less than the total number of ELLs that were tested. Not all ELLs participate in Title III programs.	

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	36713
Navajo	8599
Keres	972
Zuni	721
Vietnamese	238

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: These numbers accurately reflect the number of LEP students per language subgroup as collected in the state's Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System.

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	61473
Not tested/State annual ELP	1339
Subtotal	62812
LEP/One Data Point	545

Comments: SY 06-07 information that we currently have available in the Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System data base for the LEP/One Data Point is incomplete. This issue will be remedied by reviewing student biogrid information and crossreferencing idntification numbers for students that have taken the state's English language proficiency assessment.

"All LEP students" includes students that are in BIE schools, alternative schools and other schools that do not participate in Title III Funding, but nevertheless must be tested. Not all LEPs participate in Title III programs.

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

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

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	58163
Not tested/State annual ELP	1774
Subtotal	59937
LEP/One Data Point	545
Comments: SY 06-07 information that we currently have available in the Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System data base for the LEP/One Data Point is incomplete. This issue will be remedied by reviewing student biogrid information and crossreferencing identification numbers for students that have taken the state's English language proficiency assessment. "All LEP students" includes students that are in BIE schools, alternative schools and schools that do not participate in Title III funding, but nevertheless must be tested. Not all LEPs participate in Title III programs.	

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

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

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	50.0	17438	42.5	N
No progress		24205		
ELP attainment	20.0	14147	21.0	Y
Comments: "All LEP students" includes students that are in BIE schools, alternative schools and schools that do not participate in Title III funding, but nevertheless must be tested. Not all LEP students participate in Title III programs.				

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

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

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

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	**#**	**%**	**Yes/No**
Making progress	50.0	17438	42.5	N
No progress		24205		
ELP attainment	20.0	14147	21.0	Y
Comments: "All LEP students" includes students that are in BIE schools, alternative schools and schools that do not participate in Title III funding, but nevertheless must be tested. Not all LEPs are in Title III programs.				

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

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

MFLEP	Yes
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:

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

	#
Total MFLEP	14028
MFLEP/AYP grades	11359
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	19882
LEP HS/Non-AYP	5487
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).	Yes
Comments:	

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	Spanish
4	Spanish
5	Spanish
6	Spanish
7	Spanish
8	Spanish
HS	Spanish
Comments: A Spanish language Mathematics test is available only for the 9th and 11th Grade at the HS level.	

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	Spanish
4	Spanish
5	Spanish
6	Spanish
7	Spanish
8	Spanish
HS	Spanish
Comments: A Spanish language Reading/Language Arts test is available only for the 9th and 11th Grade at the HS level.	

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
6430	1891	29.4
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the 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
6372	2940	46.1
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
10223	3805	14028
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
11280	6179	54.8	

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: The Acting Chief Statistician of the Assessment and Evaluation Bureau indicated the following:

Some tests were invalidated. This results from:

1)Non-allowed modifications;

2)Parental Refusal;

3)Failing the "attemptedness" rule;

4)Non completion; and/or

5)Testing irregularity.

The field for Number Below Proficient did not permit us to enter data.

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
11272	3933	34.9	

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

Comments: The Acting Chief Statistician of the Assessment and Evaluation Bureau indicated the following:

Some tests were invalidated. This results from:

1)Non-allowed modifications;

2)Parental Refusal;

3)Failing the "attemptedness" rule;

4)Non completion; and/or

5)Testing irregularity.

The field for Number Below Proficient did not permit us to enter data.

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	53
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	9
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	5
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	37
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	24
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	9
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	21
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	49
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	49
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments: Improvement plans and number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years have not commenced or been identified, as we have just completed the process of indicating who has not met AMAOs using the results of our new English language proficiency assessment. 49 districts will soon begin an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs.	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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
21736	3378	8

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

Comments: The numbers here have increased from last year due to technical assistance provided to districts, the availability of funding for our immigrant population, and continued improvement with data collection by our state's Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System.

Our ability to identify and report immigrant student populations has and will continue to improve.

The number of immigrant education programs depends entirely upon the number of LEAs that submit for this competitive funding, hence the number of participants will continue to fluctuate from year to year.

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

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

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

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

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	Yes	Multi-year	No
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	Yes	Formula	No

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.	8846
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. Or number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	3281
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	997

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	35	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	34	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	33	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	29	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	29	
Other (Explain in comment box)	5	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	34	5831
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	34	7455
PD provided to principals	31	799
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	27	276
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	24	872
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	16	763
Total		15996

Comments: Explanations for "Other":

1) Professional Learning Communities

2) Professional Development targeted at parents

3) Baldridge/PDSA

4) Use of Assesssment Data to Inform Instruction

5) Vocabulary Development

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

<u>**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**</u>

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/11/06	10/03/06	84
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.

SEA officials are developing a process to ensure funding is available to LEAs as soon as the grant award is received.

The Administrative Services Division has developed and implemented a process for the review and approval of grant awards. Training was provided in February 2008 to all agency divisions and bureaus.

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: There are no schools in New Mexico identified as "Persistently Dangerous" by our state definition.	

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	86.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	85.9
Hispanic	85.2
White, non-Hispanic	91.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	84.9
Limited English proficient	77.8
Economically disadvantaged	84.5
Migratory students	0.0
Male	85.6
Female	87.9
Comments: Migratory Student data is not available.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4.3
Hispanic	4.0
White, non-Hispanic	2.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4.3
Limited English proficient	5.0
Economically disadvantaged	1.9
Migratory students	7.0
Male	3.9
Female	3.4
Comments: Last year the dropout rate was calculated using grades 9-12 while this year we used grades 7-12. The 9-12 grade span resulted in a higher dropout rate. Expanding the grade range to 7-12 resulted in a lower rate. Last year's male / female calculation was based on percent of dropout instead of the membership population. Children with disabilities (IDEA), Limited English proficient, Economically disadvantaged and Migratory were not reported last year.	

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	74	4
LEAs with subgrants	15	15
Total	89	19
Comments: The State of New Mexico is currently conducting 25 targeted technical assistance visits to districts not reporting data on Homeless Education for the current year 2007-08.		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	59
K	0	339
1	0	464
2	0	432
3	0	378
4	<N	386
5	0	388
6	<N	362
7	0	287
8	<N	309
9	<N	387
10	<N	244
11	<N	171
12	<N	147
Ungraded	0	0
Total	30	4353
Comments: The State of New Mexico is currently conducting 25 targeted technical assistance visits to districts not reporting data on Homeless Education for the current year 2007-08. Blanks occuring on this page are intended as there was not data submitted for those particular grade areas.		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	<N	824
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	21	2775
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	<N	409
Hotels/Motels	<N	345
Total	30	4353
Comments: I have added in the unaccompanied youth under Unsheltered and many of my districts reported unknown numbers as well and those I have also captured under Unsheltered. Another category submitted was substandard housing and those are once again captured under unsheltered.		

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)	64
K	335
1	437
2	414
3	359
4	375
5	374
6	349
7	280
8	297
9	376
10	234
11	167
12	144
Ungraded	0
Total	4205
Comments: The State of New Mexico is currently conducting 25 targeted technical assistance visits to districts not reporting data on Homeless Education for the current year 2007-08.	

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	69
Migratory children/youth	162
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	551
Limit English proficient students	941
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	13
2. Expedited evaluations	7
3. Staff professional development and awareness	8
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	11
5. Transportation	11
6. Early childhood programs	9
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	11
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	10
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	13
12. Counseling	13
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
15. School supplies	14
16. Referral to other programs and services	13
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
18. Other (optional)	2
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: (20) PE/MOSSA in-take for Medicaid	

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	4
2. School Selection	2
3. Transportation	5
4. School records	5
5. Immunizations	5
6. Other medical records	2
7. Other Barriers	6
Comments: (1) Lack of affordable housing (2) Locating community services for undocumented families (3) Enforcement (4) Suspensions, including long term, for behavioral problems (mental health)	

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	288	82
4	301	91
5	288	100
6	276	46
7	208	48
8	198	34
High School	229	55
Comments: 7 of 19 districts reporting had "DNA" data not available for submission on homeless children/youth served by McKinney-Vento who scored at or above proficien levels.		

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	290	69
4	300	74
5	288	61
6	276	23
7	204	16
8	189	22
High School	229	34
Comments: 7 of 19 districts reporting had "DNA" data not available for submission on homeless children/youth served by McKinney-Vento who scored at or above proficien levels.		

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

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do <u>not</u> include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	113
K	60
1	88
2	94
3	101
4	76
5	97
6	79
7	65
8	72
9	79
10	57
11	31
12	37
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	15
Total	1064
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 decrease can be attributed to many factors. The issue with increase in border security has decreased the population in the three largest districts that border Mexico. Many of the migrant students qualify due to dairy work. These student are not moving, the districts in southeast New Mexico show decreases in counts. New Mexico has experienced severe weather that cut the chile and onion production in southern New Mexico. Less people are required in the fields due to increase in machines and technology.

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

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do <u>not</u> include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	16
1	25
2	17
3	24
4	17
5	16
6	<N
7	<N
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	147
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 reasons are the same as for Category I count. In addition the decrease in Title I funds has limited the number of summer programs.

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.

MIS2000 is a distributed database application custom designed for State Migrant Education Programs. The software allows Migrant Education Programs to enter, store and produce reports on all relevant data for the students in their state, including COE information, school history information, services performed, health data, as well as any other data the MEP chooses to collect. MIS2000 is fully customized to suit the needs of the state, and enhancements are offered free of charge. Once the data is entered, it is uploaded to the state database, giving the State Director a complete and constantly updated copy of all the state's data. In order to verify the count and before any of the tables are run, our MIS2000 data entry clerk runs a snap report that is in the MIS2000 database system called "Potential Duplicate Students". A list is generated that identifies all students that have the same first and last name and same date of birth. The students are merged in the system to eliminate any duplication. A second report is run from the Potential Duplicate Students, but using different criteria. A request is made for the same first name OR last name AND same date of birth. This list is much larger. It is checked for any possible misspellings or obvious errors and we verify the COE to see if the students have the same family surname. Sometimes it is discovered that there are two COES for the same family. At that point, Art Martinez, the State Director, will follow up with the recruiters. Also, we run a built-in snap report in the MIS2000 database system called Potential Duplicate Students. It is used to merge duplicate students (same last and first name and same date of birth). Then a second report, which uses broader criteria, (same last OR first name AND same date of birth) is run. We review the electronic COE to determine if the family is the same and notify the local migrant education specialist to verify the paper COE.

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.

Through out the school year possible migrant students are identifed. Data is first collected by trained LEA recruiters. Families/parents are interviewed by trained local recruiter. If students are elegible, a COE is completed and submited for review to LEA director. Some information collected are names, birthdate, QAD, type of activity. New Mexicos COE has been revised to ensure that all the required elements are collected.. The COE's verified at the district level, sent to the state for additional verification and entered into the MIS2000 system. In addition, each district send in a hard copy of each COE to the state office.

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.

Completed and signed COEs are sent the state migrant office for review. Once the COEs are reviewed they are sent to ERTC. ERTC personell has been trained by trainers from MSEDD in order to input data into the MIS2000 system. This person inputs data, and is able to run various reports at the state or local level.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 2 count was collected and maintained the same.

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.

MIS2000 is a distributed database application custom designed for State Migrant Education Programs. The software allows Migrant Education Programs to enter, store and produce reports on all relevant data for the students in their state, including COE information, school history information, services performed, health data, as well as any other data the MEP chooses to collect. MIS2000 is fully customized to suit the needs of the state, and enhancements are offered free of charge. Once the data is entered, it is uploaded to the state database, giving the State Director a complete and constantly updated copy of all the state's data. In order to verify the count and before any of the tables are run, our MIS2000 data entry clerk runs a snap report that is in the MIS2000 database system called "Potential Duplicate Students". A list is generated that identifies all students that have the same first and last name and same date of birth. The students are merged in the system to eliminate any duplication. A second report is run from the Potential Duplicate Students, but using different criteria. A request is made for the same first name OR last name AND same date of birth. This list is much larger. It is checked for any possible misspellings or obvious errors and we verify the COE to see if the students have the same family surname. Sometimes it is discovered that there are two COES for the same family. At that point, Art Martinez, the State Specialist, will follow up with the recruiters. Also, we run a built-in snap report in the MIS2000 database system called Potential Duplicate Students. It is used to merge duplicate students (same last and first name and same date of birth). Then a second report, which uses broader criteria, (same last OR first name AND same date of birth) is run. We review the electronic COE to determine if the family is the same and notify the local migrant education specialist to verify the paper COE.

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 system.

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.

All local recruiters are trained at the beginning of each year to ensure consistency. After recruiters have finished COE, it is reviewed by local director. COEs are also reviewed at the state level. ERTC, the data entry contractor also reviews COE for accuracy. In addition New Mexico has contracted with Eductional Research and Training Corporation to conduct a reinterview process. The process involves randomly selecting COE's, conducting a re-interview, and verified at ERTC.

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.

Re-interview project has not been completed.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to have quality control, there is only one data entry input person. There is a system to check COEs at the recruiter, director and state level before input. In addition, reports are sent to districts on a quarterly basis for sites to review and validate.

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.

Data is compiled at the local level. Local sites send in a "hard copy" of migrant performance data. MIS2000 produces a report. The data is compared for accuracy by data input specialist and by state director, any discreptions are fixed and data is submitted.

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.

Additional training. New Mexico state director has contacted MERC. MERC will provide training to all state recruiters during spring New Mexico Migrant Conference.

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.

New Mexico does not have any concerns with the accuracy of reported child counts.

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

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