

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

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2010-11**

**NEW JERSEY**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012**

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 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 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).



**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2010-11**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011  
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.

New Jersey has conducted an alignment study and other analysis to align our item banks to the Common Core State Standards. Over the next couple of years. The NJ assessment of skills and knowledge (ASK for grades 3 through 8) will transition to include items that are aligned to the CCSS and to the rigor associated with the CCSS. New Jersey will have a new High School assessment system and Alternative Proficiency Assessment that will align with the content and rigor of the CCSS.

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 2010-11, 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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 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)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
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	<u>No</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
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	<u>No</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 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	723,649	720,535	99.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	800	798	99.8
Asian	63,547	63,417	99.8
Black or African American	119,397	118,390	99.2
Hispanic or Latino	149,122	148,450	99.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,459	1,454	99.7
White	382,721	381,515	99.7
Two or more races	6,603	6,511	98.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	121,927	120,319	98.7
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	22,110	21,999	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	242,522	241,104	99.4
Migratory students	248	245	98.8
Male	371,431	369,525	99.5
Female	351,559	350,382	99.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	21,128	17.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	90,981	75.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,210	6.8
Total	120,319	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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	723,675	720,630	99.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	800	793	99.1
Asian	63,547	63,330	99.7
Black or African American	119,403	118,427	99.2
Hispanic or Latino	149,130	148,514	99.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,459	1,454	99.7
White	382,732	381,645	99.7
Two or more races	6,604	6,467	97.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	121,942	120,423	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,110	21,906	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	242,531	241,159	99.4
Migratory students	248	246	99.2
Male	371,446	369,563	99.5
Female	351,570	350,457	99.7
<b>Comments:</b> LEP EXEMPT students are counted as participating (1.2) and included in the LEP and students with disabilities subgroup counts, but were not assigned a proficiency level or included in 1.3			

### 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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	21,131	17.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	90,965	75.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,315	6.9
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	12	0.0
Total	120,423	
<b>Comments:</b> LEP EXEMPT students are counted as participating (1.2) and included in the LEP and students with disabilities subgroup counts, but were not assigned a proficiency level or included in 1.3		

### 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	313,069	309,371	98.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	348	344	98.9
Asian	27,400	27,300	99.6
Black or African American	51,326	50,096	97.6
Hispanic or Latino	62,914	61,933	98.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	596	594	99.7
White	167,011	165,698	99.2
Two or more races	3,474	3,406	98.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	50,982	49,725	97.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,876	8,752	98.6
Economically disadvantaged students	99,363	97,542	98.2
Migratory students	89	88	98.9
Male	160,227	158,082	98.7
Female	152,519	150,990	99.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	8,717	17.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	38,791	78.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,217	4.5
Total	49,725	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	101,911	80,252	78.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	108	81	75.0
Asian	9,487	8,784	92.6
Black or African American	16,550	9,861	59.6
Hispanic or Latino	23,017	15,499	67.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	229	202	88.2
White	51,394	44,920	87.4
Two or more races	1,126	905	80.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,126	10,845	63.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,174	2,576	49.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37,892	24,284	64.1
Migratory students	48	20	41.7
Male	52,395	41,086	78.4
Female	49,446	39,125	79.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	101,622	64,113	63.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	105	66	62.9
Asian	9,368	7,498	80.0
Black or African American	16,495	7,266	44.0
Hispanic or Latino	23,007	11,012	47.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	229	156	68.1
White	51,307	37,366	72.8
Two or more races	1,111	749	67.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,130	6,831	39.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,892	1,440	29.4
Economically disadvantaged students	37,767	16,962	44.9
Migratory students	48	16	33.3
Male	52,221	30,505	58.4
Female	49,333	33,578	68.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
<b>Comments:</b> N/A for Grade 3			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	103,444	81,752	79.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	105	86	81.9
Asian	9,462	8,798	93.0
Black or African American	17,190	10,252	59.6
Hispanic or Latino	22,542	15,431	68.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	214	191	89.3
White	52,956	46,251	87.3
Two or more races	975	743	76.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	18,268	11,039	60.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,549	1,682	47.4
Economically disadvantaged students	37,407	24,188	64.7
Migratory students	36	22	61.1
Male	53,378	41,935	78.6
Female	49,995	39,782	79.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	103,156	64,806	62.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	104	67	64.4
Asian	9,316	7,713	82.8
Black or African American	17,140	6,881	40.1
Hispanic or Latino	22,531	10,416	46.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	214	157	73.4
White	52,890	38,961	73.7
Two or more races	961	611	63.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	18,284	6,653	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,257	782	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	37,296	15,794	42.3
Migratory students	36	14	38.9
Male	53,207	31,445	59.1
Female	49,879	33,336	66.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	103,314	92,671	89.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	105	92	87.6
Asian	9,452	9,068	95.9
Black or African American	17,160	13,388	78.0
Hispanic or Latino	22,519	18,335	81.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	214	201	93.9
White	52,894	50,700	95.9
Two or more races	970	887	91.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	18,211	13,953	76.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,543	2,047	57.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37,347	29,944	80.2
Migratory students	36	25	69.4
Male	53,300	47,540	89.2
Female	49,944	45,078	90.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	103,821	83,477	80.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	106	81	76.4
Asian	9,413	8,877	94.3
Black or African American	17,278	10,475	60.6
Hispanic or Latino	22,123	15,735	71.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	192	169	88.0
White	53,721	47,356	88.2
Two or more races	988	784	79.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,873	10,045	56.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,904	1,374	47.3
Economically disadvantaged students	36,781	24,471	66.5
Migratory students	40	26	65.0
Male	53,349	42,564	79.8
Female	50,399	40,866	81.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	103,543	63,125	61.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	103	57	55.3
Asian	9,276	7,563	81.5
Black or African American	17,234	6,485	37.6
Hispanic or Latino	22,108	9,481	42.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	192	132	68.8
White	53,651	38,824	72.4
Two or more races	979	583	59.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,873	5,756	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,647	475	17.9
Economically disadvantaged students	36,669	14,383	39.2
Migratory students	40	13	32.5
Male	53,196	30,544	57.4
Female	50,277	32,552	64.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
<b>Comments:</b> N/A for grade 5			

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	104,716	80,837	77.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	117	84	71.8
Asian	8,903	8,232	92.5
Black or African American	17,748	9,826	55.4
Hispanic or Latino	21,633	14,482	66.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	207	181	87.4
White	55,165	47,343	85.8
Two or more races	943	689	73.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,486	8,297	47.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,645	1,006	38.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36,020	22,431	62.3
Migratory students	33	20	60.6
Male	53,650	41,036	76.5
Female	50,971	39,745	78.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	104,415	69,688	66.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	116	72	62.1
Asian	8,762	7,395	84.4
Black or African American	17,669	7,921	44.8
Hispanic or Latino	21,625	11,130	51.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	207	149	72.0
White	55,103	42,406	77.0
Two or more races	933	615	65.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,464	5,585	32.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,375	531	22.4
Economically disadvantaged students	35,889	17,012	47.4
Migratory students	33	15	45.5
Male	53,488	33,232	62.1
Female	50,841	36,416	71.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
<b>Comments:</b> N/A for grade 6			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	104,735	68,772	65.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	113	66	58.4
Asian	8,951	7,919	88.5
Black or African American	17,294	6,911	40.0
Hispanic or Latino	21,128	10,660	50.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	216	176	81.5
White	55,998	42,434	75.8
Two or more races	1,035	606	58.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,206	5,414	31.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,642	668	25.3
Economically disadvantaged students	34,921	16,249	46.5
Migratory students	38	17	44.7
Male	54,135	35,533	65.6
Female	50,481	33,190	65.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	104,534	66,232	63.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	113	59	52.2
Asian	8,826	7,314	82.9
Black or African American	17,264	6,661	38.6
Hispanic or Latino	21,124	9,293	44.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	215	159	74.0
White	55,968	42,147	75.3
Two or more races	1,024	599	58.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,215	4,654	27.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,418	303	12.5
Economically disadvantaged students	34,824	14,203	40.8
Migratory students	38	11	28.9
Male	54,034	31,791	58.8
Female	50,386	34,399	68.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
<b>Comments:</b> N/A for Grade 7			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	104,294	74,451	71.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	128	86	67.2
Asian	8,863	8,063	91.0
Black or African American	17,080	7,976	46.7
Hispanic or Latino	20,814	11,941	57.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	186	139	74.7
White	56,273	45,631	81.1
Two or more races	950	615	64.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,202	5,679	33.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,652	800	30.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33,415	17,819	53.3
Migratory students	35	18	51.4
Male	53,522	38,105	71.2
Female	50,645	36,290	71.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	104,236	85,474	82.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	127	95	74.8
Asian	8,770	8,117	92.6
Black or African American	17,092	10,847	63.5
Hispanic or Latino	20,838	14,600	70.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	187	151	80.7
White	56,284	50,927	90.5
Two or more races	938	737	78.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,257	8,394	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,458	816	33.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33,403	22,096	66.1
Migratory students	36	21	58.3
Male	53,489	42,036	78.6
Female	50,621	43,360	85.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	104,133	84,382	81.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	128	101	78.9
Asian	8,863	8,225	92.8
Black or African American	17,026	10,439	61.3
Hispanic or Latino	20,758	14,238	68.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	187	161	86.1
White	56,223	50,507	89.8
Two or more races	948	711	75.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,141	8,807	51.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,642	879	33.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,326	21,711	65.1
Migratory students	35	19	54.3
Male	53,439	43,055	80.6
Female	50,568	41,256	81.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	97,614	73,386	75.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	121	86	71.1
Asian	8,338	7,624	91.4
Black or African American	15,250	7,504	49.2
Hispanic or Latino	17,193	10,296	59.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	210	182	86.7
White	56,008	47,396	84.6
Two or more races	494	298	60.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,158	5,552	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,433	785	32.3
Economically disadvantaged students	24,668	13,961	56.6
Migratory students	15	9	60.0
Male	49,096	37,290	76.0
Female	48,445	36,060	74.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	97,694	87,267	89.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	121	106	87.6
Asian	8,331	7,870	94.5
Black or African American	15,291	11,955	78.2
Hispanic or Latino	17,214	13,809	80.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	210	199	94.8
White	56,030	52,947	94.5
Two or more races	497	381	76.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	15,188	9,356	61.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,429	868	35.7
Economically disadvantaged students	24,702	19,402	78.5
Migratory students	15	11	73.3
Male	49,129	42,587	86.7
Female	48,494	44,626	92.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	101,924	58,669	57.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	111	59	53.2
Asian	8,985	7,263	80.8
Black or African American	15,910	4,529	28.5
Hispanic or Latino	18,656	6,688	35.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	193	132	68.4
White	56,581	39,434	69.7
Two or more races	1,488	564	37.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	14,373	2,963	20.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,567	257	10.0
Economically disadvantaged students	26,869	8,469	31.5
Migratory students	17	3	17.6
Male	51,343	29,315	57.1
Female	50,478	29,320	58.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	2,314	1,079	46.6
Districts	631	448	71.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 SY 2010-11 . 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 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	1,441	561	38.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	415	96	23.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,026	465	45.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
534	354	66.3
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. 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 2011-12 (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)<sup>1</sup>)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<sup>1</sup> 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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	43
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	7
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	13
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	6
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	18
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	51
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	102
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

--

## 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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. 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 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

The NCLB School Improvement Unit located in the Office of Title I provides ongoing assistance to districts and schools in the areas of curriculum, assessment, instruction, school culture, community, data analysis, parent involvement, professional learning and leadership. Below is a brief description of the following assistance:

- Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) school support team reviews
- Follow-up Benchmark meetings
- Collaborative Benchmark Visits focused on implementation of the Restructuring Plan (Governance)
- Unified Plan Workshops
- School Improvement Learning Community
- School Improvement Advisory Committee
- Districts in Need of Improvement (DINI) Effective Instruction Series
- Restructuring technical assistance
- Data Analysis Workshops

The NCLB school support team process, Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement (CAPA), provides on-the-scene review, consultation and follow-up to schools in improvement status. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/capa/>. CAPA is a partnership among NJDOE, schools and districts, and local educators, designed to empower schools and districts to go beyond current efforts to improve student achievement.

Number of Districts/Schools served: 25 schools in 25 districts  
Duration: 3 days of preparation and follow up by one person  
4 day visit with support team

CAPA strives to pinpoint obstacles to student achievement, identify needs and develop solutions to improve school performance and provide a learning environment where students achieve. The Teaching and Learning Tool provides the rubric for conducting these visits.

Collaborative Benchmark Follow Up Meetings provide ongoing technical assistance to Title I schools and districts in need of improvement to aid them in implementing CAPA recommendations, conducting of data analysis, needs assessment and creation of the 2012 unified school improvement plan and review of SIA Part A activities. The benchmark meetings were conducted by 36 school improvement consultants.

Number of Districts/Schools served: 267 schools in 80 districts  
Duration: 2 days for each school

Collaborative Benchmark Restructuring (Governance) Visits focus on implementation of the school's restructuring plan. Collaboration and capacity building related to governance as defined in the restructuring plan are the principles guiding this support. The improvement process includes a three-day on-site visit for schools in Year 5H and 6 (Restructuring).

Number of Districts/Schools served: 26 schools in 15 districts  
Duration: 3 days of preparation and follow up by one person  
3 day visit with support team

SIA Part (a) Update - FY 2011 Title I, School Improvement Part (a) fund allocations were distributed to Title I schools designated as Tier I, II and III. In order for schools to receive these funds, a representative was required to attend a technical assistance session. 262 representatives were in attendance from 45 school districts. A second session provided one-on-one assistance by school improvement consultants for 30 schools. 192 SIA Part A reviews were conducted with feedback and discussion of implementation of school improvement strategies.

Districts In Need of Improvement - There were 58 districts identified with status as follows:  
42 are in Year 1 or 2  
4 are in Year 3; 4 are in Year 4; 5 are in Year 5; and 3 are in Year 7

Districts attended a workshop on the development of the DINI Plan. Districts (16) in corrective action were required to attend a series of six workshops conducted by Mr. Mike Miles regarding district improvement and effective instruction. The

combined attendance at the six sessions totaled 483.

2011 Unified Plan Workshops - Five 2011 NCLB Unified Plan Workshops for newly identified schools in need of improvement (SINIs) had a total attendance of 270. These one-day workshops are designed to assist SINIs in year 2 and above in the development of the 2012 Unified Plan. Combined attendance at 25 workshops was 1,129 people.

Using Data to Improve and Inspire Student Achievement - School and district teams attended one of five regional two-day workshops on data analysis with Dr. Tracey Severns. Workshop topics include: Identifying the types, sources and uses of data for getting to the root cause; analyzing data from Learnia and NJ SMART's EdAnalyzer, evaluating of the Unified Plan Strategies, conducting data analysis activities with Professional Learning Communities, and action planning for both the 2011 and 2012 Unified Plan. 442 individuals attended these workshops.

Research Forums with REL - Rutgers University - NJDOE and Rutgers University, Regional Education Laboratory, 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 partnership with Rutgers University continues in 2011. The forums cover such topics as Dropout Prevention, Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision-Making, Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning, Encouraging Girls in Math and Science, and Improving Reading Comprehension in K-3. 414 individuals attended these workshops.

**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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	14
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	4
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	4
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	7	1
Schools	10	2
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	12/12/11
---	----------

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

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 2010-11.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) 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 2010-11 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 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

##### School Improvement Grant (SIG) Technical Assistance and Evaluation

32 schools were eligible to apply for a SIG grant in 2010; 27 applications were received and grants were awarded to 12 schools in 6 districts. Principals were on board by August, 2010.

A five-day summer academy was held in August 2010. Speakers included Kati Haycock from EdTrust, Ryan Tyler and others from the Mid Atlantic Comprehensive Center, Jackie Norris (School Culture) from The College of New Jersey and Mike Miles from District Two in Colorado Springs.

Seven Network Turnaround Officers (NTO) were hired and assigned to schools in August. Training for the NTOs provided by MACC through a partnership with Edvantia using the Performance Coaching model from Tennessee. The Network Turnaround Officer (NTO) assigned to each school provides oversight to the LEA and school through periodic reporting to the NJDOE. Input from the NTO was used during the decision making process regarding the annual renewal of the grant. The NTO plays a critical role in turning around struggling schools. As a facilitator of reform, the NTO is responsible for initiating improvements in classroom instruction by helping to incorporate research-based practices to identify solutions to problems with student learning. In collaboration with the school principal, the NTO establishes a clear pathway toward distributed leadership within the schools, working with a highly-capable team to build a cohesive, professional teaching culture. The NTO also helps the principal develop turnaround management skills. As an evaluator, the NTO monitors the schools' adherence to the intervention plan and tracking performance metrics, including academic achievement, against quantifiable plan objectives and assist the NJDOE in making decisions about the annual renewal of the SIG grant.

NTOs spend at least 100 days in each of the 12 SIG Cohort 1 schools.

A SIG Principal's Network met monthly with an average attendance of 40 at each of nine full day meetings.

##### 1.11 NJDOE OVERSIGHT (from Notice of Grant Opportunity NGO)

Full day onsite evaluation visits were conducted at each of the 12 Cohort 1 schools. In addition to the review of quarterly/final fiscal and program reports, the NJDOE provided oversight to the grantees using on-site visits, an evaluation as well as through reports from the school's Network Turnaround Officer.

On-site visits are conducted by NJDOE to evaluate the implementation of the SIG plan and to determine if the schools are executing the selected model with fidelity. The monitoring determines barriers to the implementation and takes action to assist the school and district in resolution to ensure the success of the project.

Statewide NJ Effective Practices Conference - April 12, 2011 - The statewide New Jersey Effective Practices Conference was held Tuesday, April 12, 2011 at the Princeton Westin with a total of 470 in attendance; 90 school districts were represented. Seventeen workshops were presented by 19 schools in 13 districts.

**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 2010-11 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.

NONE

### 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.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	169,239
Applied to transfer	1,341
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	908
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 900,612

**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.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	117

**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:**

<sup>3</sup> 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*.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	173,789
Applied for supplemental educational services	33,723
Received supplemental educational services	26,797
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 33,409,325
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	300,649	300,287	99.9	362	0.1
All elementary classes	186,218	186,049	99.9	169	0.1
All secondary classes	114,431	114,238	99.8	193	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.

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	99.0
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	0.0
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)	1.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NJ has changed the certification for elementary general ed teachers from K-8 license to K-5 license. Those teachers holding the newer K-5 certificate must obtain a new endorsement to teach above grade 5. These teachers, if assigned to teach in grades 6-8 (even when these grades are in a K-8 configured school) are not highly qualified if they have not obtained the middle school endorsement. These are reported in the "Other" category.

	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)	93.7
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	6.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 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.

**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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	56,293	56,183	99.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	45,621	45,610	100.0
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	26,830	26,703	99.5
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	32,754	32,754	100.0

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	58.3	7.4
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	48.3	8.4
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	

**FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty**

- a. *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.
- b. *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.
- c. *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.
- d. *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](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, Hatian-Creole, Portuguese, Gujarati, Arabic
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<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 implemented in New Jersey schools 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	56,140
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.	54,870
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	37,550
Arabic	1,689
Haitian; Haitian Creole	1,280
Chinese	1,106
Korean	1,106

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	56,113
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	27
Total	56,140
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14,626
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	26.1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	54,843
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	27
Total	54,870
<b>Comments:</b>	
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).	
	<b>#</b>
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.	16,718

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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 Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- 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 percent of students 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	17,806	46.7	29,356	77.00
Attained proficiency	14,233	26.0		

**Comments:** Comments on the Making Progress results: The data is preliminary, pending district corrections. In the 2010-11 year there were numerous districts that lacked complete, consistent data that met our data quality standards. This affected the calculations for AMAO 1 primarily. We are working to correct this problem in 2012 by generating the ELP test pre-id labels from the NJSMART system, thus ensuring the integrity of student data. In the meantime, districts will have an opportunity to review, correct and supply missing 2010 or 2011 student data that prevented the matching of students. This will change the number of students that met the AMAO 1 target in each affected district and the total number of districts that met AMAO 1.

Comments on the Attained Proficiency results: 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: 5% of students that have been enrolled in a language assistance program for less-than-one year through 4 years must have achieved a 4.5 on the ACCESS for ELLs test. Cohort 2: 50% of students who have been enrolled in a language assistance program 5+ years must have attained a 4.5 on the ACCESS for ELLs test.

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

**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
<b>Comments:</b>

**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
<b>Comments:</b>

**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
<b>Comments:</b>

**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
4,996	4,070	9,066
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9,066	6,253	69.0	2,813
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for 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 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
9,059	4,200	46.4	4,859
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,819	2,152	76.3	667
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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	215
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	86
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	95
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	200
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	215
# - 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 2009-10 and 2010-11)	15
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 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 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	1

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:** The data is preliminary, pending district corrections. In the 2010-11 year there were numerous districts that lacked complete, consistent data that met our data quality standards. This affected the calculations for AMAO 1, primarily. We are working to correct this problem in 2012 by generating the ELP test pre-id labels from the NJSMART system, thus ensuring the integrity of student data. In the meantime, districts will have an opportunity to review, correct and supply missing 2010 or 2011 student data that prevented the matching of students. This will change the number of students that meet the AMAO 1 target in each affected district and the total number of districts that met AMAO 1. The 215 districts above include 42 consortia with 179 districts. A total of 352 districts received Title III funds/services in 2010-11.

#### 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>
<b>Comments:</b> The data on AMAO 1, Making Progress, is preliminary pending district corrections. Once all districts have supplied missing data and made corrections to the data that will enable the matching of students that took the ELP test in 2010 and 2011, we will recalculate AMAO 1.	

#### 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	<u>No</u>
---	-----------

goals?

If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or 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
40,363	18,567	76

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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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 <b>additional</b> 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 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	114	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	131	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	113	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	88	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	52	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	44	158
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	132	277
PD provided to principals	20	23
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	114	190
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	2	2
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	312	650

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Four separate professional development workshops were offered as orientation for new and experienced supervisors of language assistance programs.

### 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 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/10	09/01/10	60
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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 project start date is 9/1/10 and that was the date on which districts could begin to charge expenditures.
---

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	94.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	92.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	98.6
Black, non-Hispanic	90.1
Hispanic	90.3
White, non-Hispanic	97.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	82.3
Limited English proficient	99.9
Economically disadvantaged	92.4
Migratory students	99.4
Male	94.0
Female	95.6
<b>Comments:</b> Difference from zero, collection includes all required subpopulations, last year not reported.	

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). 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	1.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3.7
Hispanic	2.9
White, non-Hispanic	0.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3.9
Limited English proficient	4.0
Economically disadvantaged	2.5
Migratory students	0.0
Male	1.9
Female	1.5
<b>Comments:</b> Based on district reported data. Migrant reported less than 1% 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	674	674
LEAs with subgrants	6	5
Total	680	679
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	197	85
K	412	123
1	416	126
2	390	103
3	389	102
4	362	111
5	354	106
6	327	100
7	294	97
8	276	87
9	268	100
10	200	78
11	186	72
12	227	77
Ungraded	0	0
Total	4,298	1,367
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,145	252
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,659	880
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	18	10
Hotels/Motels	476	225
Total	4,298	1,367
<b>Comments: *</b>		

## 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)	85
K	123
1	126
2	103
3	102
4	111
5	106
6	100
7	97
8	87
9	100
10	78
11	72
12	77
Ungraded	0
Total	1,367

**Comments:**

### 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	8
Migratory children/youth	118
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	257
Limited English proficient students	47

**Comments:**

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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	350	135
4	304	94
5	321	98
6	252	97
7	241	80
8	214	127
High School	121	82
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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	350	193
4	304	161
5	324	173
6	255	124
7	242	85
8	216	86
High School	122	57
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	170
K	98
1	93
2	105
3	108
4	93
5	87
6	73
7	55
8	49
9	42
10	33
11	28
12	20
Ungraded	3
Out-of-school	631
Total	1,688

**Comments:** The decrease in total eligible students can be attributed to the effects of the anti-immigrant sentiment which is causing fewer migrant workers and their families to migrate or take the risk of migrating too far from their home states/countries in fear of being harassed, detained or deported.

**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 total eligible students can be attributed to the effects of the anti-immigrant sentiment which is causing fewer migrant workers and their families to migrate or take the risk of migrating too far from their home states/countries in fear of being harassed, detained or deported.

**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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	129
K	69
1	69
2	50
3	46
4	48
5	41
6	37
7	26
8	21
9	16
10	13
11	7
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	373
Total	948
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

N/A

**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. Child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system (COE Star).
---

**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. School districts initiate referrals through communication with the regional MEP offices. If referral is received, it is disseminated to a recruiter responsible for that corresponding geographical area. The recruiters make phone calls and schedule home visits in order thoroughly interview families and determine eligibility. Farms, packing houses and retail establishments which migrant families are known to frequent, are canvassed by recruiters on a regular basis. At this time, individuals are interviewed on the spot, eligibility determined, and COEs are completed (if eligible). Finally, migrant families communicating information on additional migrant families may result in the scheduling of additional interviews to determine eligibility. Sometimes these take place in the home or place of employment.
3. Elements contained within the COE include demographic information, school enrollment and movement data.
4. Completed COEs are reviewed by the regional director at each local project, and entered into the COEStar database by the data specialist. If any clarification is requested by the director, communication between the regional director, recruiter and family may be required. Pertinent information acquired through these communications is then incorporated into the COE prior to final approval. Recruiters may enter COEs remotely into the COEStar database. A hard copy of the COE is provided to the regional director for review and approval. The data specialist retrieves the COE remotely entered for verification and notation of approval by the director. This completes the process.
5. Data are collected at the point of arrival and enrollment - Tromik uploads the data to the MSIX every five days.
6. The collection process is the same for category I and category II; without separate procedures.

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 approved until reviewed by the regional MEP director and verified by the regional data specialist. COEstar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to identify both the Regular school year and Summer/Intercession Childcounts, in addition to other reports required for CSPR submission 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.

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 begins.

-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 2010-2011 period, implemented the following procedures and processes to ensure optimal quality control central to the accuracy of eligibility decisions:

(New Jersey's retrospective reinterviewing 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
- 2010-2011 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 regional MEP directors and the 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 SEA staff review and verify all counts with the regional project directors/project staff and TROMIK for accuracy prior to submission to ED.

New Jersey's state MEP coordinator reviewed a random sample of 100 certificates of eligibility (COE). The sampling universe was all migrant children, ages 3 through 21, whose eligibility was determined during the period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. A systematic random sample was used, with every fifth record drawn and reviewed for eligibility based upon the information provided on the COE. Of the 100, 100 of the records accurately assigned eligibility to the migrant children and youth enrolled.

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.

The NJ MEP will be developing an agreement with an independent reviewer to conduct prospective reinterviews among a preselected sample of enrolled students drawn from local projects current COE's. It is anticipated that the process will commence in June 2012, prior to our busiest agricultural season when the majority of families are migrating into our state. This time period has been selected to help increase the likelihood that the individuals selected to be re-interviewed will be present in the state.

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