

**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 2009-10

NEW JERSEY



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: New Jersey		
Address: 100 River View Plaza Trenton, New Jersey 08625		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Clare Barrett		
Telephone: (609) 292-5408		
Fax: (609) 633-6874		
e-mail: clare.barrett@doe.state.nj.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Christopher D.Cerf		
		Thursday, April 28, 2011, 3:09:55 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Common Core Standards were adopted in June 2010 and will be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year in LAL and Math. New Science Standards were also adopted and will be implemented during the 2011-2012 school year.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state's assessments and academic achievement standards in mathematics and LAL are currently undergoing the ED's peer review process and have not yet been approved. The assessments will be revised once the Common Core standards are implemented statewide in 2012-2013.
--

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	90.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	10.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	No
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
Comments: ,,,	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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 mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	726,592	723,010	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	785	778	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	63,819	63,683	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	121,516	120,324	99.0
Hispanic	143,667	142,918	99.5
White, non-Hispanic	392,070	390,686	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	120,985	118,985	98.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,508	21,386	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	234,982	233,373	99.3
Migratory students	212	205	96.7
Male	373,158	370,959	99.4
Female	352,895	351,554	99.6
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,509	14.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	93,454	78.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,022	6.7
Total	118,985	
Comments:		

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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	726,607	721,666	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	785	770	98.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	63,819	62,923	98.6
Black, non-Hispanic	121,519	120,077	98.8
Hispanic	143,671	142,871	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	392,078	390,457	99.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	120,992	119,068	98.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,508	19,808	92.1
Economically disadvantaged students	234,986	232,773	99.1
Migratory students	212	205	96.7
Male	373,163	370,211	99.2
Female	352,905	350,967	99.5
Comments: Includes Students with disabilities that are Lep exempt (students who took the ELP in lieu of the regular LAL assessment) as NOT participating.			

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 reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,528	14.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	93,505	78.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,053	6.8
Total	119,086	
Comments: Includes Students with disabilities that are Lep exempt (students who took the ELP in lieu of the regular LAL assessment) as participating		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	313,833	309,304	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	385	378	98.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,190	27,065	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	52,227	50,681	97.0
Hispanic	61,179	60,117	98.3
White, non-Hispanic	170,461	168,883	99.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	50,546	48,878	96.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,203	9,052	98.4
Economically disadvantaged students	95,108	93,202	98.0
Migratory students	109	104	95.4
Male	160,242	157,716	98.4
Female	153,179	151,328	98.8
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,414	15.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	39,198	80.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,266	4.6
Total	48,878	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (*LEP*) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,292	80,387	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	92	78.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,636	8,879	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	17,370	10,043	57.8
Hispanic	22,280	14,748	66.2
White, non-Hispanic	53,177	46,106	86.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,907	10,445	61.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,802	2,344	48.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37,088	23,169	62.5
Migratory students	40	23	57.5
Male	53,280	41,385	77.7
Female	49,943	38,967	78.0
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	102,991	61,462	59.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	116	73	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,514	7,436	78.2
Black, non-Hispanic	17,274	6,995	40.5
Hispanic	22,257	9,745	43.8
White, non-Hispanic	53,120	36,790	69.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,900	5,839	34.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,518	1,144	25.3
Economically disadvantaged students	36,940	14,920	40.4
Migratory students	40	13	32.5
Male	53,113	28,701	54.0
Female	49,806	32,737	65.7
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,509	79,302	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	111	80	72.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,591	8,763	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,374	9,555	55.0
Hispanic	21,714	14,271	65.7
White, non-Hispanic	54,000	46,127	85.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,424	9,487	54.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,562	1,575	44.2
Economically disadvantaged students	36,387	22,274	61.2
Migratory students	33	15	45.5
Male	53,125	40,784	76.8
Female	50,320	38,482	76.5
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,159	61,399	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	62	56.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,444	7,420	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,281	6,616	38.3
Hispanic	21,698	9,126	42.1
White, non-Hispanic	53,921	37,767	70.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,419	5,403	31.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,241	658	20.3
Economically disadvantaged students	36,238	13,949	38.5
Migratory students	33	4	12.1
Male	52,939	28,828	54.5
Female	50,158	32,547	64.9
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,418	96,086	92.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	105	93.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,590	9,280	96.8
Black, non-Hispanic	17,362	14,620	84.2
Hispanic	21,690	19,003	87.6
White, non-Hispanic	53,949	52,427	97.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,378	14,302	82.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,558	2,476	69.6
Economically disadvantaged students	36,349	31,300	86.1
Migratory students	33	21	63.6
Male	53,074	49,084	92.5
Female	50,279	46,951	93.4
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104,225	81,765	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	106	77	72.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,088	8,448	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17,847	10,386	58.2
Hispanic	21,140	14,313	67.7
White, non-Hispanic	55,366	48,044	86.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,626	9,070	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,784	1,204	43.2
Economically disadvantaged students	35,813	22,722	63.4
Migratory students	32	13	40.6
Male	53,424	41,713	78.1
Female	50,725	40,010	78.9
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,929	65,429	63.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	54	51.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,954	7,349	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	17,786	7,441	41.8
Hispanic	21,110	9,926	47.0
White, non-Hispanic	55,301	40,268	72.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,611	5,322	30.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,511	522	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	35,674	15,307	42.9
Migratory students	32	3	9.4
Male	53,270	30,681	57.6
Female	50,587	34,719	68.6
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104,153	74,507	71.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	68	65.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,139	8,194	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	17,433	8,016	46.0
Hispanic	20,569	12,259	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	56,196	45,552	81.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,044	6,683	39.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,595	846	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	34,831	18,809	54.0
Migratory students	17	8	47.1
Male	53,750	38,057	70.8
Female	50,320	36,430	72.4
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,898	67,775	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	100	57	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,007	7,536	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	17,398	7,258	41.7
Hispanic	20,544	9,833	47.9
White, non-Hispanic	56,148	42,686	76.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,051	4,962	29.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,358	399	16.9
Economically disadvantaged students	34,721	15,127	43.6
Migratory students	17	4	23.5
Male	53,598	32,857	61.3
Female	50,219	34,898	69.5
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104,463	67,009	64.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	124	77	62.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,964	7,802	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17,440	6,587	37.8
Hispanic	20,559	9,924	48.3
White, non-Hispanic	56,664	42,276	74.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,060	4,780	28.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,539	546	21.5
Economically disadvantaged students	33,645	14,669	43.6
Migratory students	27	10	37.0
Male	53,717	34,452	64.1
Female	50,658	32,525	64.2
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104,232	71,884	69.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	124	78	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,841	7,674	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	17,395	8,148	46.8
Hispanic	20,544	10,668	51.9
White, non-Hispanic	56,624	44,908	79.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,069	5,098	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,301	375	16.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,532	16,016	47.8
Migratory students	27	10	37.0
Male	53,596	34,951	65.2
Female	50,552	36,891	73.0
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104,028	71,043	68.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	115	74	64.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,827	7,820	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,235	7,323	42.5
Hispanic	19,864	10,642	53.6
White, non-Hispanic	57,331	44,821	78.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,260	5,136	29.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,747	798	29.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31,912	15,588	48.8
Migratory students	22	11	50.0
Male	53,249	36,352	68.3
Female	50,699	34,663	68.4
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	104,052	85,400	82.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	114	92	80.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,718	8,100	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17,282	11,149	64.5
Hispanic	19,914	13,731	69.0
White, non-Hispanic	57,379	51,871	90.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,337	8,264	47.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,528	769	30.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31,938	20,991	65.7
Migratory students	22	11	50.0
Male	53,261	41,670	78.2
Female	50,709	43,687	86.2
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	103,949	85,879	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	116	95	81.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,815	8,193	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17,207	10,969	63.7
Hispanic	19,842	13,729	69.2
White, non-Hispanic	57,315	52,413	91.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,215	9,345	54.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,736	967	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31,865	21,027	66.0
Migratory students	23	9	39.1
Male	53,206	44,003	82.7
Female	50,663	41,831	82.6
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	99,340	73,322	73.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	63	62.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,438	7,689	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	15,625	7,315	46.8
Hispanic	16,792	9,685	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	57,952	48,326	83.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,664	5,301	33.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,357	666	28.3
Economically disadvantaged students	23,697	12,750	53.8
Migratory students	34	8	23.5
Male	50,414	37,427	74.2
Female	48,889	35,884	73.4
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	99,405	86,049	86.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	102	90	88.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,445	7,909	93.7
Black, non-Hispanic	15,661	10,951	69.9
Hispanic	16,804	12,645	75.2
White, non-Hispanic	57,964	54,131	93.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,681	8,615	54.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,351	641	27.3
Economically disadvantaged students	23,730	17,199	72.5
Migratory students	34	9	26.5
Male	50,434	42,067	83.4
Female	48,936	43,967	89.8
Comments: Effects of small n-size			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	101,937	57,069	56.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	150	70	46.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,660	6,769	78.2
Black, non-Hispanic	16,112	4,360	27.1
Hispanic	18,585	6,200	33.4
White, non-Hispanic	57,619	39,353	68.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,285	3,065	21.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,758	265	9.6
Economically disadvantaged students	24,988	7,522	30.1
Migratory students	48	11	22.9
Male	51,436	28,820	56.0
Female	50,386	28,222	56.0
Comments: The change is due to the fact that this is the first year NJ is reporting Science at the High school level.			

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, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	2,333	1,197	51.3
Districts	630	440	69.8
Comments: NJ administered new assessments in grades 3 and 4 in SY2009, last year's AYP included results from SY2009 transition year.			

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 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	1,425	608	42.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	396	84	21.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,029	524	50.9
Comments: NJ administered new assessments in grades 3 and 4 in SY2009, last year's AYP included results from SY2009 transition year.			

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
515	328	63.7
Comments:		

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	18
Extension of the school year or school day	10
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	7
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	8
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	12
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
Comments: Data collection is not complete, NJ will update when CSPR I reopens	

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	55
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	61
Comments: Data collection is not complete, NJ will update when CSPR I reopens	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following were the other major restructuring of the school governance actions that were implemented:

- Redistributed responsibilities among administrative staff.
- Provided administrative support for the principal such as team leaders, department chairs, teacher leaders, coaches and highly skilled professionals.
- Changed the reporting structure of staff.
- Identified responsibilities of key people and assess their practices. Have written job expectations and evaluations.
- Instituted structured accountability of key personnel.
- Hired a facilitator.
- Instituted a peer mentoring program.
- Brought in highly skilled professionals.
- Developed a new learning structure with academies/smaller classes with a defined chain of command/team teaching.
- Restructured schedules and/or functions: create a data office/build in more time for teachers.
- Expanded or narrowed the grades served; for example, narrow a K-8 school to a K-5 elementary school.
- Implemented a comprehensive school reform model that impacts how the school is governed.
- Increased district oversight, decrease school-based management prerogatives, or some combination.

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Seventeen districts in corrective action were designated for intensive assistance in 2009-2010. The four major initiatives, designed to improve district capacity, are described below.

1. Systems thinking for development of the DINI Plan

Three DINI technical assistance sessions were conducted. Mike Miles, of Harrison School District in Colorado Springs, CO conducted two workshops regarding district leadership and systems thinking when implementing instructional strategies.

2. District Support Services Project

The DINI Project of intervention provides onsite technical assistance and support. The intent of the project is to assist districts with the design and implementation of scientifically research based programs as well as the completion of the required DINI plan. A DINI support specialist was assigned to each district with the requirement of at least one meeting per month to review the implementation of the action plan portion of the DINI plan.

3. Scientifically Research-based workshop series—data analysis, conducting walkthroughs, four seminars using IES practices guides NJDOE and Rutgers University, Regional Education Laboratory (REL), Mid-Atlantic Center at Rutgers University continue to collaborate to present relevant research developed as practice guides. The forums are part of the New Jersey statewide system of support for schools and districts in need of improvement.

The New Jersey Department of Education invited a team of three people to one of four regional two-day workshops on data analysis. Workshop topics included: Identifying the types, sources and uses of data for getting to the root cause; analyzing data from Learnia and NJ SMART's DataAnalyzer, evaluating of the unified plan strategies, conducting data analysis activities with Professional Learning Communities, and action planning for the unified plan.

4. Collaborative Benchmark Meetings

Collaborative benchmark meetings provide ongoing technical assistance to districts in need of improvement to aid them in implementing the unified plan, conducting of data analysis using one and three-year trend charts and cluster results, needs assessment and creation of the unified school improvement plan. School Improvement Consultants conduct walkthroughs with school leaders to a minimum of ten classrooms to review the implementation of instructional strategies and look at trends in the classrooms. During the fall benchmark meeting a review and feedback regarding the unified plan with the district/school leadership team is conducted. Documentation of effectiveness in how the SIA(a) program was implemented and how the funds were expended. If SIA(a) funds were carried over, it is determined how these funds are spent in the current year. The focus of the spring benchmark meeting is needs assessment and evaluation of current programs.

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	17
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	9
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	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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 SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	2	1
Schools	18	2
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	12/10/10
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	96,762	98,301
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	46,274	46,557
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	47.8	47.4
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	96,903	98,233
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	46,120	47,485
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	47.6	48.3
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	19
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	2

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	199
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used	Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies) (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	N/A	6	0	1		N/A
2	N/A	104	0	10		N/A
3	N/A	2	0	0		N/A
4	N/A	2	0	0		N/A
5	Curriculum Alignment Effective Walkthroughs Classroom Management Improved Grade Level Meetings Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessments Differentiated Instruction Increased Use of Technology SIOP Implementation Use of Learning Centers Use of Data to Improve Instruction Common Planning Time Student Learning Profiles Establishing College Pathways Improved Instruction	12	0	0	D	Improved job embedded professional development in Special Education, Math and Language Arts through coaches Decrease in special education classification Implementation of Professional Learning Communities Formative Assessment Decrease in discipline referrals and suspensions Increase in staff attendance Increased opportunities for teacher collaboration Increased sharing of effective practices Better understanding of use of data Implementation of a mentoring program for students
6 = Combo 1	N/A	20	0	2		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box
 1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school

staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Effective strategies for districts and schools identified in 1.4.8.3 were shared during workshops, conferences, technical assistance sessions and while conducting Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) visits and meetings. Below is a description of some of these activities.

- The CAPA process includes an initial visit to schools in corrective action and benchmark follow up meetings twice each year. If the school progresses to restructuring, a shorter return benchmark visit is conducted.
- During a CAPA visit, district and school staff members serve as partners on the team in an effort to build local capacity to oversee their low-performing schools. Their participation serves as a tool for professional learning to introduce and reinforce successful research-based practices.
- A CAPA consultant learning community meets monthly for the following purpose: Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the statewide system of support that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures. CAPA consultants are knowledgeable about NJDOE policies, procedures and initiatives as well as experts and leaders in school improvement and the CAPA process. Each learning community agenda includes one or more research-based practice.
- The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center continues to assist in documenting case studies from identified schools with established effective practices in key areas in addition to making significant gains in student achievement. These schools represent an important opportunity to learn how the leadership in these schools were able to implement effective practices under challenging circumstances (pressure from being identified for improvement for several consecutive years, high poverty student populations, high mobility, etc.). The case studies have been documented with evidence that is shared with schools in advanced levels of status.
- Nine schools were awarded "reward grants" for meeting the federal AYP targets for two years in a row. This success is particularly notable since the schools were previously in an advanced level of school improvement status. The school's improvement efforts resulted in rising student achievement. In exchange for receiving the reward grant, the district and school agree to do the following:
 - Participate in effective practice case study project—includes a school visit by a team of DOE staff to gather information on at least two effective practices;
 - Present the effective practice at showcase workshops;
 - Permit observation of the effective practice by other schools
- Thirty workshops for schools in need of improvement were conducted to assist in the development of a school improvement plan (Title I Unified Plan) to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the school, so that greater numbers of students achieve proficiency in the areas of language arts literacy and mathematics. The agenda included how to annually conduct a comprehensive needs assessment based upon most recent achievement goals and actual performance.
- On June 11, 2010, 300 educators attended an Awards Conference that emphasized practical application and program delivery for NCLB. Sessions were presented by panels of distinguished schools and reward grant schools who shared best practices, successes, and challenges. Each session was directed by a school improvement consultant who moderated the panel.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g)(8) funds were not used in 2009-2010.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

CAPA is a professional learning opportunity for district and school staff members who participate as members on the CAPA team. The CAPA team membership usually includes NJDOE staff, outside experts, the principal from the school and district and school representatives from language arts literacy and mathematics. Special education and bilingual education team members are added if indicated. A thoughtful, systematic and evidence-based approach is used to reach agreement about the strengths and the changes needed to make a positive difference in teaching and learning. At the conclusion of the visit, the entire team develops a report of findings and recommendations that will be provided to the district and school.

The Division of District and School Improvement (DSI) and the Division of Field Services is funded with state monies. The mission of both divisions is to provide guidance, support and resources to assist districts and schools in meeting the high-quality standards established by the New Jersey State Board of Education. The scope of work centers on improvement in the five key areas of school district effectiveness identified in the New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (QSAC) as: Instruction and Program, Personnel, Operations Management, Fiscal Management and Governance, as well as the school-level standards established by the Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) process.

These divisions work collaboratively with other department program offices and external organizations to deliver high-quality supports and resources to districts and schools. Efforts are aligned with the paradigm shift of the department's work with districts from compliance to assistance, building capacity and improvement. Specific activities of involvement include providing professional development and technical assistance to schools and districts in need of improvement, developing and implementing efficient methods of communicating improvement activities, establishing a resource of materials to prepare schools and districts for monitoring and assisting with the continuous improvement of the QSAC monitoring.

Title I SINIs have access to the expertise provided by The Turnaround Leadership Professional Learning Community Network, a professional development initiative to create collegial networks for school leaders across the state. The initiative fosters the abilities of educational leaders by providing opportunities to enhance and hone leadership skills. Through an established partnership with Montclair State University (Northern Region), The College of New Jersey (Central Region), and Rowan University (Southern Region), the network works to assist new and veteran educational leaders, as well as those in schools in years three to five of NCLB corrective action status. Partnering with these universities, members of the network discuss theoretical concepts of leadership as well as practical applications with their fellow administrators in the field.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	131,316
Applied to transfer	978
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	702
Comments:	

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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 405,367

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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	96

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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	142,413
Applied for supplemental educational services	28,678
Received supplemental educational services	23,572
Comments:	

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	\$ 33,559,769
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	342,128	341,606	99.8	522	0.2
All elementary classes	216,808	216,591	99.9	217	0.1
All secondary classes	125,320	125,015	99.8	305	0.2

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In elementary classes, a full-day self contained classroom equals one class.
--

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

In the tables 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	62.7
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	33.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	4.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other - Certified Teacher of Students with Disabilities has not completed companion instructional endorsement

	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)	27.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	63.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	9.3
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other - Certified Teacher of Students with Disabilities has not completed companion instructional endorsement

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	63,681	63,530	99.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	51,788	51,780	100.0
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	26,462	26,215	99.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	35,423	35,421	100.0
1.5.3.1 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.			

1.5.3.1 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	45.4	4.9
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	42.3	5.2
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Haitian-Creole, Portuguese, Gujarati
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Portuguese,
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other language assistance program models that are implemented in New Jersey include bilingual resource room, high intensity ESL, bilingual tutorial and part-time bilingual education.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	55,656
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of 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.	54,004
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	38,298
Arabic	1,488
Chinese	1,328
Korean	1,277
Haitian; Haitian Creole	1,113

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1,041 Gujarati 848 Portuguese 675 Urdu 670 Bengali 467 Vietnamese 402 Turkish 389 Polish 386 Japanese 368 French 365 Tagalog 361 Russian
--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	55,556
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	100
Total	55,656
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10,889
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	19.6
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	53,905
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	99
Total	54,004
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	25,606

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	23,965	84.7	21,582	76.00
Attained proficiency	10,347	19.2		
Comments: Nothing is entered in the attainment targets because there are two cohorts. In order to meet the AMAO for attaining proficiency, districts must meet two cohorts as follows: Cohort 1: 4% of students that have been in a language assistance program <1 through 4 years must have achieved a 4.5 on the ACCESS for ELLs test and exited the program. Cohort 2: 40% of students who have been in a language assistance program 5+ years must have attained a 4.5 on the ACCESS for ELLs test and exited the program.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>Yes</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>Yes</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,235	5,091	10,326
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,326	6,750	65.4	3,576
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students 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
10,324	4,688	45.4	5,636
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,064	2,570	83.9	494
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	196
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	156
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	177
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	173
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	194
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	4
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: There were 196 subgrantees, including 44 consortia. Each consortium is counted as a unit. Including consortium participants, there were 347 LEAs that received Title III funds. Consortia are counted as a unit for AMAO determinations, because most consortium districts have fewer than 10 students.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The State did not meet AMAO 2 as a result of not meeting one of the cohort targets. The attainment target for the cohort of students that are in programs 5 or more years is 40%; the statewide total percentage of students in this cohort that met the target is 32%.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
41,279	11,593	53

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) ð The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course ð (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 as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	3,494
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	200

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	231	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	117	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	102	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	79	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	44	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	75	224
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	105	251
PD provided to principals	17	30
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	80	141
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	39	69
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	316	715

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/09	9/15/09	75
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees by making AYP data available to districts earlier. Districts need this information in order to complete the needs assessment section of the NCLB application.
--

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	
Comments: The count is zero.	

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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	94.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	86.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	98.4
Black, non-Hispanic	90.4
Hispanic	89.2
White, non-Hispanic	96.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	80.4
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	93.7
Female	95.0

Comments: The state has been using its aggregate collection to produce the leaver rate for graduation. The current aggregate collection did not contain 2008-09 graduate data by the sub-groups of LEP, economically disadvantaged, or migratory. Hence they are not in the pre-populated data from 041. All sub-groups will be included in the adjusted cohort graduation rates for the class of 2011.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NJ Department of education has had permission from the federal government to use the disaggregated dropout rate as its interim secondary measure for AYP through the 2009-10 school year. This was necessary because the DOE lacked the ability to create a cohort calculation until the student-level system held four years of student data. The first cohort began in 2007 which will enable us to calculate the cohort graduation rate for the graduating class of 2011. The disaggregated graduation rate will be introduced in the 2011 NJ school report card that is released in February 2012. Because of the timing of the data collection, it is necessary to lag the data for AYP purposes, and the first year that the adjusted cohort graduation rate will be used as a secondary measure for high schools for AYP will be in 2012.

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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.5
Hispanic	3.0
White, non-Hispanic	0.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2.8
Limited English proficient	2.8
Economically disadvantaged	1.9
Migratory students	0.0
Male	1.9
Female	1.4
Comments: Based on district reported data. Migrant reported less than 1.0% dropout.	

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	644	623
LEAs with subgrants	6	6
Total	650	629
Comments: NJ response: All subgrantees have reported, data reflects changes.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	225	409
K	431	197
1	438	175
2	380	112
3	376	96
4	410	137
5	354	97
6	298	108
7	280	92
8	280	85
9	294	75
10	245	81
11	219	49
12	249	39
Ungraded	0	19
Total	4,479	1,771
Comments:		

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	1,019	868
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,752	808
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	20	0
Hotels/Motels	688	95
Total	4,479	1,771
Comments:		

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)	196
K	78
1	76
2	69
3	64
4	79
5	64
6	57
7	59
8	57
9	57
10	66
11	40
12	31
Ungraded	19
Total	1,012

Comments: NJ Response: Data has been updated

1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	36
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	245
Limited English proficient students	103

Comments: NJ Response: Data has been updated

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School Selection	2
Transportation	2
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School enrollment

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 *ESEA* 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 *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	126	34
4	114	35
5	99	28
6	78	27
7	81	28
8	85	54
High School	74	44
Comments:		

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 *ESEA* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	128	62
4	115	55
5	101	48
6	79	31
7	80	21
8	85	35
High School	72	24
Comments:		

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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 under Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

a. 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.

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	145
K	77
1	100
2	133
3	121
4	119
5	103
6	71
7	64
8	59
9	41
10	39
11	19
12	21
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	752
Total	1,864

Comments: no ungraded

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease in the Category 1 Child Count may be attributed to adverse growing (abnormally rainy season which prompted families to move on to other states prior to being identified) in addition to the anti-immigrant sentiment which discouraged migratory workers from migrating as they would have typically done.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	111
K	49
1	55
2	61
3	62
4	66
5	52
6	34
7	42
8	26
9	21
10	16
11	2
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	411
Total	1,011
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The greater than 10 percent decrease in the Category 2 Count may be attributed to adverse growing conditions (abnormally rainy season) which prompted migratory workers to migrate from New Jersey prior to being identified; in addition to the anti-immigrant sentiment which discouraged migrant workers from migrating when they would have typically done so.

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.

NJ MEP uses COEstar system to compile and generate data related to migrant students in both Category I & II programs.

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.

1. Data is collected at the time of enrollment by the MEP recruiters employed by the local projects. The collection is done via interviews which results in the completed Certificate of Eligibility (COE).
2. Elements contained within the COE, includes demographic information, school enrollment and movement data.
3. Completed COE's are reviewed by the data managers at each local project, prior to submission to TROMIK- the regional data manager.
4. Data are collected at the point of arrival and enrollment - Tromik uploads the data to the MSIX every 5 days.
5. The collection process is the same for category 1 and category II; without separate procedures.
For recertification see section 1.10.3.4 on re-interviewing.

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.

COEstar is our primary filing system for student information from the COE to the collection of services. Although data are inputted both manually and through electronic COEs no data is entered into our database until the COE is verified by the regional migrant education project director. COEstar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to provide the Childcount and additional reports for the Performance Report submitted by the New Jersey Department of Education.

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.

N/A The data are not collected or maintained differently.

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;
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children who were between age 3 through 21
 As a result COEstar's ability to keep electronic copies of the official state Certificate of Eligibility all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the accounts are performed. Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edits checks on data as it is entered the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of test on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source.
 As COEstar keeps a copy of the actual COE calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he/she can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility).
 By virtue of completing a COE the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulations. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.
 COEstar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.
 -Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were within 3 years of a last qualifying move had a qualifying activity);
 The information collected by the recruiter through the interview process and recorded on the COE is verified by the program director prior to being entered in the COEstar database and monitored by TROMIK.
 -Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
 TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to confirm that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would verify that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the school year listed on the school enrollment records QAD dates residency dates enrollment dates withdrawal dates departure dates needs assessment and graduation/termination dates special services dates and health record dates performed in this state during the period.
 -Children who in the case of Category 2-received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;
 Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Entry of this data means that the State served during the summer/intersession term. Additionally services information can be added to indicate the nature of services; however the summer/intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service began.
 -Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
 COEstar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state region county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level eligible children are counted only once statewide in each eligible category. Upon the process of data entry at the regional level the data specialist scans the consolidated data base to look for duplicates. Prior to student information being added to the COEstar system a search is conducted to determine whether the student record already exists. In the instance a duplicate is found the record is not entered into the data base. Additionally all COEs are thoroughly inspected and reviewed by the regional program director as an ongoing practice to ensure quality assurance.
 Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in School wide programs and TAS programs funded by MEP in both regular and summer/intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

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.

N/A Category II children were generated using the same system.

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.

In order to verify that children included in the two Childcounts meet the eligibility criteria (according to 34 CFR22.40) all COEs are reviewed and approved by regional project directors before data is entered into the student information system. For children enrolled in a prior year but still eligible to be counted safeguards are built into the COEstar system to ensure that no child is counted who reached end of eligibility prior to the beginning of the service period. As part of mass enrollment lists of preschoolers and nonattending young adults are generated and recruiters must verify by home visit or telephone that these children and youth are still residing in the area as of September 1. Training is provided to data managers/specialists by their respective program directors. In addition the New Jersey Department of Education's contract with TROMICK Technology includes extensive and ongoing training and technical assistance to the regional subgrantees in the area of data collection. The COE is a standard document used by our MEP subgrantees in both the northern and southern regions of the state which allows a level of conformity between the two regions and throughout the state. Finally the state has provided written guidance on eligibility; which is reviewed annually and reinforced during trainings and monitors the regional migrant programs which includes conducting random audits of COEs and migrant lists for eligibility determinations.

*We should note that COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Once verified each COE can be marked as verified and locked; invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NJ MEP, during the 2009-2010 period, implemented the following procedures and processes to ensure optimal quality control central to the accuracy of eligibility decisions:

- An annual sample review was conducted by the NJ MEP, in which the MEP coordinator reviewed 100 randomly sampled COEs to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. Of the 100 COEs reviewed, 96 were found to be eligible. (New Jersey's re-interviewing efforts are tentatively scheduled with an outside contractor to take place between early May through September to coincide with the peak period in which families migrate to our state.)

- Regional MEP project directors in-serviced staff during scheduled trainings, providing "debriefing" activities to ensure thorough knowledge of eligibility and related ID/R issues.

- Recruiters "shadowed" peers in critiquing the recruiting process

- State coordinator/ID&R coordinator accompanied recruiters in the field to more actively assess performance and offer guidance in ID&R

- 2009-2010 program year trainings which included:

- o Interpersonal skills and communication;

- o Cultural sensitivity;

- o Interviewing protocol and strategies;

- o Eligibility determination process (including the interpretation of complex scenarios); and

- o Recording and maintaining appropriate documentation

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New Jersey Department of Education is committed to ensuring that its system of data collection is reliable and accurate. Measures to ensure the integrity of data collection for the Migrant Education Program specifically the Childcount Data will be scrutinized at the highest level. Checks and balances have and will continue to be incorporated into this process through a comprehensive system to include: appropriate ID&R training random audits of COEs and the quarterly review of all regional MEP data by the migrant director and state coordinator.

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.

As mentioned previously New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked

concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process. Finally SFA staff review and verify all counts with the regional project directors/project staff and TROMIK for accuracy prior to submission to ED.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NJ MEP is negotiating with an independent contractor to conduct reinterviews among a preselected sample of enrolled students, drawn from local projects current COE's. It is anticipated that the process will commence in May/June 2011, when the bulk of enrollment occur.

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.

N/A