



1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	3,299	792	24.0
Districts	72	2	2.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,335	227	17.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,301	218	16.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	34	9	26.5
Comments: Based on guidance from EDEN Partner Support, Florida reported schools with too few students to calculate AYP as AYP Status = NOT REQUIRED. There were 30 such schools: 4 TA and 26 SW schools. As a result the count of Title I schools shown in row 1, column 1 in Section 1.4.2 (above) shows 30 less Title I schools than there actually are in Florida. The total number of Title I schools in Florida is 1,365: 1327 SW and 38 TA.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
72	2	2.8
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	66
Extension of the school year or school day	28
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	10
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	97
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	52
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	200
Comments: Replacement of principal is reported with staff; it is not collected independently.	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	25
Comments: 2006 -2007, CSPR asked for the restructuring option being implemented. 2007-2008 data asks for restructuring actions that were implemented. 2007-2008. 27 schools are in restructuring.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other major restructuring of the school governance action(s) implemented includes (1)establish smaller learning communities that reorganize the school by narrowing or expanding gradespans (2)close the school (3) diminish site based management, and (4) consolidated schools.

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	67
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	51	9
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	09/29/08
---	----------

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

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

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

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

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	90,640	0
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	40,074	0
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	44.2	0.0
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	37,270	0
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	41.1	0.0
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	2,460	
Comments: No 1003a funds were withheld in 2007 -2008 due to reduction in State Title I allocation. 2003g funds were allocated for the first time in 07-08.		

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

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	18
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	3
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	226
Comments: N/A	

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

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		119	0	14	A	NA
2		2	0	0	A	NA
5	Extend the school day for tutorials	38	0	0	A	NA
6 = Combo 1	1 and 2	10	0	0	A	NA
7 = Combo 2	1 and 5	77	0	0	A	NA
		0	0	0		NA
		0	0	0		NA
		0	0	0		NA

Comments:Data are provided for 1003(g) funds only, as Florida was unable to reserve 1003(a) funds in 2007 -08. Data for Column 4 cannot be provided. No 1003(a) funds were disbursed during the 2007-08 school year; 2007-08 was the first year schools implemented strategies using 1003(g) funds.

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

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

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

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As of the submission date of CSPR Part I, the Department was in the process of developing a website specifically pertaining to successful strategies for school improvement. The website will be ready by mid-March, and will include information about the strategies implemented with Sections 1003(a) and (g) funds and data from CSPR and other sources that show the success of schools receiving such grants. The LEAs will be notified of this website and asked to review the information contained therein when developing future applications for these funds.

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 0.0 %

Comments: There were no funds set aside in FY 2007 for Section 1003(a). Florida normally reserves 4% of the Title I, Part Allocation for School Improvement under Section 1003(a), which for 2007-08 would have equaled \$23,566,285. However, as a result of USDE data recalculations, significant reductions in funding to the State for Fiscal Year 2007-08 and the hold harmless provision for calculating allocations to LEAs, Florida was not able to set aside any funds for School Improvement activities under Section 1003(a).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Florida Department of Education retained 5 percent, or \$286,493, of its total 2007-08 allocation of \$5.7 million for state level activities. These funds were consolidated, consistent with provisions of P.L. 107-110, Section 9201 and Florida's approved consolidated application. Florida is fully cognizant of its responsibilities with respect to meeting the requirements of P.L. 107-110, Section 1003(g), and the applicable requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, Sections 1116 and 1117.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the 2007-08 school year, the Florida Department of Education used state funds, Title II, Part A and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act funds for statewide support to low-performing schools. Title I schools planning for or in restructuring were provided services including identifying and implementing evidence-based school improvement processes and continuous improvement models. In addition, funds were used to provide statewide trainings on data disaggregation by the Center for Data Driven Reform in Education.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	694,846
Applied to transfer	19,140
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	7,041

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments: Per the guidance from EDEN Partner Support, for school year 2007 -08, Florida reported only students who transferred during school year 2007-08 under the provisions for public school choice in accordance with Title I, Part A, Section 1116. For school year 2006-07 Florida's interpretation of the guidance for these data was to report any student who transferred to a school under the provisions for public school choice in accordance with Title I, Part A, Section 1116 and had not matriculated to a new school. As a result, the number of students who transferred to a school under the provisions for public school choice in accordance with Title I, Part A, Section 1116 for school year 2007-08 was less than the number of students for school year 2006-07.	

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$10,481,155
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	9
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	522,043
Applied for supplemental educational services	98,672
Received supplemental educational services	66,259
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$76,771,712
Comments:	

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