

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:**

**Parts I and II**

**for**

**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**

**under the**

**ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT**

**As amended by the**

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on

**School Year 2007-08**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**

**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 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 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Office of the State Sup. of Edu., Division of Ed.		
Address: 51 N Street, NE - 7th Floor Washington, DC 20002		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Shanika Hope		
Telephone: 202-741-0278		
Fax: 202-741-0277		
e-mail: shanika.hope@dc.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Shanika Hope, Assistant Superintendent of Elementary and Secondary Education		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:51:57 PM
Signature		Date

The State is still in the process of compiling survey data for the summary of how Title V, Part A funds contributed to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. 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 taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The District of Columbia State Board of Education adopted academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts in April 2005 and science standards in April 2006. These standards define the common knowledge and skills that all children should know and be able to do at each grade level. The DC Office of the State Superintendent is planning to make revisions to the mathematics, reading/language arts and science standards according to the following timeline:

Subject Cyclical Review Schedule Implementation Reading/ELA 2009-2010 2010-2011 Mathematics 2009-2010 2010-2011 Science 2010-2011 2011-2012

The DC State Board of Education and DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education have embarked upon a 5-year Strategic Plan and A Call to Innovate vision that provide the framework for leading the District towards the education system which produces students capable of competing in the 21st century creative economy. One of the core principles of our plan is to ensure that all students will graduate from District of Columbia schools prepared to succeed in a 21st century creative economy as positive, productive, and informed citizens of our community and the world. The DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education will review and revise academic content standards through an alignment process that identifies the English and mathematics standards most critical for high school graduates to enter into credit-bearing coursework in two-or four-year colleges, without the need for remediation and with a strong chance for earning credit toward their program or degree. The state will conduct deliberate and thorough analyses to determine the extent to which our current and revised state standards for reading/language arts and mathematics align to the new demands for college and career readiness. This same procedure will be used during the science standards review process.

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

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts 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 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.

No revisions made to the DC CAS or DC CAS ALT assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in SY 2007-2008.

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

### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below 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 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 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.

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."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State Science academic standards were submitted as part of the 08 peer review and approved in 2008.

Approval of State Science assessments is still pending.

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. 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.

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	33,159	31,829	96.0
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	474	466	98.3
Black, non-Hispanic	28,071	26,868	95.7
Hispanic	3,040	2,953	97.1
White, non-Hispanic	1,572	1,540	98.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,948	5,157	86.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,103	2,052	97.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,843	21,162	96.9
Migratory students	56	40	71.4
Male	16,521	15,711	95.1
Female	16,636	16,116	96.9
<b>Comments: Alternate Assessment data are not included here.</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 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. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		

Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	493	100.0
Total	493	
<b>Comments: Regular assessment with Accommodations in Math=5153</b> <b>Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards=493</b> <b>Total=5646</b>		

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	33,159	32,316	97.5
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	474	465	98.1
Black, non-Hispanic	28,071	27,317	97.3
Hispanic	3,040	2,977	97.9
White, non-Hispanic	1,572	1,555	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,948	5,646	94.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,103	2,058	97.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,843	21,483	98.4
Migratory students	56	35	62.5
Male	16,521	16,028	97.0
Female	16,636	16,286	97.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 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 NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	33,159	31,823	96.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	467	456	97.6
Black, non-Hispanic	28,071	26,873	95.7
Hispanic	3,040	2,946	96.9
White, non-Hispanic	1,572	1,539	97.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,948	5,156	86.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,494	2,425	97.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,843	21,156	96.9
Migratory students	56	35	62.5
Male	16,521	15,705	95.1
Female	16,636	16,116	96.9
<b>Comments: The DC CAS Alternate Science data not included, not available yet. DC public charter school data not included.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
<b>Comments: The DC CAS Alternate Science data not included, not available yet. DC public charter school data not included.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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.

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

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

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

#### **1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (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.

### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,804	2,270	47.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	83	59	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,863	1,658	42.9
Hispanic	519	206	39.7
White, non-Hispanic	328	276	84.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	599	83	13.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	462	163	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	3,127	964	30.8
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	2,419	861	35.6
Female	2,321	866	37.3

**Comments: The data that is currently present is preliminary data, the state expects to have the current data in by May 2009 as stated in our submission plan; the state will provide up to date data at that point.**

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,740	2,224	46.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	83	59	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,863	1,658	42.9
Hispanic	525	259	49.3
White, non-Hispanic	328	287	87.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	599	137	22.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	462	199	43.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,127	1,298	41.5
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	2,419	996	41.2
Female	2,321	1,228	52.9

**Comments: The data that is currently present is preliminary data, the state expects to have the current data in by May 2009 as stated in our submission plan; the state will provide up to date data at that point.**

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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>
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Grade 03 was not tested in Science.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,662	2,147	46.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	81	69	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,825	1,551	40.5
Hispanic	449	253	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	307	274	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	730	174	23.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	501	278	55.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,046	1,200	39.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,370	1,024	43.2
Female	2,292	1,123	49.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,663	2,139	45.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	81	62	76.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,827	1,587	41.5
Hispanic	448	214	47.8
White, non-Hispanic	307	276	89.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	730	218	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	500	228	45.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3,047	1,179	38.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,370	970	40.9
Female	2,293	1,169	51.0
<b>Comments: FEP students included are here.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Grade 4 was not tested in Science in 2008.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,663	1,978	42.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	69	48	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,902	1,506	38.6
Hispanic	434	201	46.3
White, non-Hispanic	258	223	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	841	142	16.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	400	163	40.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,152	1,148	36.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,361	963	40.8
Female	2,302	1,015	44.1
<b>Comments: FEP students included.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,663	2,124	45.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	69	46	66.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,902	1,619	41.5
Hispanic	434	230	53.0
White, non-Hispanic	258	229	88.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	840	195	23.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	399	172	43.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,153	1,227	38.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,360	925	39.2
Female	2,303	1,199	52.1
<b>Comments: FEP students included</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,490	1,456	32.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	67	41	61.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,751	1,055	28.1
Hispanic	419	143	34.1
White, non-Hispanic	253	217	85.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	741	94	12.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	389	107	27.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,046	761	25.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,260	700	31.0
Female	2,230	756	33.9
<b>Comments: DC CAS Alternate Assessment data not included here, data not available yet.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	4,722	1,830	38.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	57	44	77.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,990	1,393	34.9
Hispanic	450	202	44.9
White, non-Hispanic	225	191	84.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	945	131	13.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	309	108	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,212	1,104	34.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,318	860	37.1
Female	2,404	970	40.3
<b>Comments: FEP students included</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	4,722	2,022	42.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	57	39	68.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,991	1,572	39.4
Hispanic	450	211	46.9
White, non-Hispanic	224	200	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	945	213	22.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	308	105	34.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,212	1,218	37.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,318	928	40.0
Female	2,404	1,094	45.5
<b>Comments: FEP students included.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Gr 06 was not tested in Science in 2008.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,654	1,898	40.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	55	51	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,037	1,505	37.3
Hispanic	406	212	52.2
White, non-Hispanic	154	129	83.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	921	134	14.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	263	102	38.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,186	1,159	36.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,336	879	37.6
Female	2,317	1,019	44.0
<b>Comments: FEP students included.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,654	1,941	41.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	55	38	69.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,037	1,590	39.4
Hispanic	406	180	44.3
White, non-Hispanic	154	132	85.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	921	165	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	263	74	28.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,186	1,162	36.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,336	813	34.8
Female	2,317	1,128	48.7
<b>Comments: FEP students included.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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>
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Gr 07 was not tested in Science in 2008.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	5,032	2,021	40.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	52	38	73.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,399	1,647	37.4
Hispanic	410	190	46.3
White, non-Hispanic	167	144	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,092	180	16.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	282	97	34.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,392	1,206	35.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,525	958	37.9
Female	2,506	1,062	42.4
<b>Comments: FEP students included.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	5,033	2,048	40.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	52	36	69.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,399	1,713	38.9
Hispanic	411	153	37.2
White, non-Hispanic	167	143	85.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,092	163	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	283	61	21.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3,393	1,219	35.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	2,526	858	34.0
Female	2,506	1,189	47.4
<b>Comments: FEP students included</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	4,603	1,011	22.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	48	27	56.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,014	751	18.7
Hispanic	383	105	27.4
White, non-Hispanic	155	127	81.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	848	26	3.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	247	39	15.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,106	512	16.5
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	2,269	487	21.5
Female	2,334	524	22.5
<b>Comments: DC CAS Alternate not included here, data not available yet.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	3,861	1,462	37.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	64	49	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,366	1,131	33.6
Hispanic	314	174	55.4
White, non-Hispanic	117	108	92.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	483	63	13.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	190	90	47.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,359	758	32.1
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	1,707	612	35.9
Female	2,154	850	39.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	3,865	1,588	41.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	64	28	43.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,368	1,294	38.4
Hispanic	316	158	50.0
White, non-Hispanic	117	108	92.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	483	72	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	192	51	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	2,362	805	34.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	1,709	616	36.0
Female	2,156	972	45.1
<b>Comments: FEP students included.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment 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	831	271	32.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	N<10	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	799	256	32.0
Hispanic	29	14	48.3
White, non-Hispanic	N<10	N<10	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	114	14	12.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	550	174	31.6
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	372	109	29.3
Female	459	162	35.3
<b>Comments: Data not available yet: DC CAS Alternate data, public charter schools.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

#### 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 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	186	43	23.1
Districts	37	7	18.9
<b>Comments: The result for this data was reported on file N103 (AYP Status) through the ED Facts reporting system which reported data (37) for only the districts or LEAs that were required to test students and report on students' AYP results. The other LEAs not part of the reported 37 cater for students below 3rd grade or upgraded students who are not required to report their AYP status.</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 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	186	43	23.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	180	38	21.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	6	5	83.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. 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
52	7	13.5
<b>Comments: The result for this data was reported on file N103 (AYP Status) through the ED Facts reporting system which reported data (37) for only the districts or LEAs that were required to test students and report on students' AYP results. The other LEAs not part of the reported 37 on section 1.4.1 cater for students below 3rd grade or upgraded students who are not required to report their AYP status.</b>		

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

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

## 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 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))
- 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.

<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 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	3
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
<b>Comments:</b>	

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)	15
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	3
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

Grade level reconfiguration Instituted Wrap-around Service Model

## 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 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 Action )
- 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.

<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.

Districts were required to develop improvement plans. The following supports and assistance were made available to Districts identified for improvement or corrective action: guidance documents, templates and rubrics, on-site meetings; workshops; professional development and webinars and telephone conferences.

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

### 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	1
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	1
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	1
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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	19	17
Schools	29	18
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	08/06/08
---	----------

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

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

#### 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	49,691	53,649
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	15,391	13,951
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	31.0	26.0
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	17,321	18,726
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	34.9	34.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	121	
<b>Comments: For SY 2007-08 the SEA did not disseminate 1003(g) funds.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.2 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	26
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	0
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	115
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.4.8.3 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
<b>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.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		10	5	4	B	
2		10	0	4		As documented, there were no responses for either C or D.
3		3	0	1		As documented, there were no responses for either C or D.
4		0	4	4		
5		10	0	2		
<b>Comments:</b>						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

--

  

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.

Through agency website, school support team members, guidance documents, rubrics, templates, sample documents and conference invitations.

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: 4.0 %

**Comments: Description of how the State Education Agency will use the state-level reservation for state-level activities.**

The total amount available for state level responsibilities, under sections 1116 and 1117, including carrying out the State educational agencies Statewide System of technical assistance and support for local educational agencies, will be an amount equal to 5% of the 4% set-aside (\$95k FY 2009).

Funds will support portions of salaries, fringe benefits, and support for consultants assigned to the School Improvement Office. Consultants will be assigned to provide assistance to schools identified as being in Title I School Improvement. Support activities will include:

- Supporting LEAs in completing a needs assessment in assigned schools;
- Reviewing and analyzing assessment, and other data to assist school personnel in identifying its needs;
- Identifying programmatic issues that are impacting on teaching and learning;
- Developing an action plan, in conjunction with school and central office staff, to address the major needs identified through the needs assessment process;
- Conducting, or coordinating, professional development activities based on identified needs;
- Increasing the capacity of the school and central office to sustain improvement once services are withdrawn;
- Identifying research-based strategies and programs that will assist schools in improving student achievement; and
- Identifying strategies and initiatives that will assist served schools in narrowing the achievement gaps that may exist.

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.

Due to the fact that there were no 1003(g) funds distributed to the LEAs, there were no evaluation and technical activities provided by the State under Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA during SY 2007-2008.
---

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.6 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.

Funds supported portions of salaries, fringe benefits, and support for consultants assigned to the School Improvement Office. Consultants were assigned to provide assistance to schools identified as being in Title I School Improvement. Support activities will included:

- Supporting LEAs in completing a needs assessment in assigned schools;
- Reviewing and analyzing assessment, and other data to assist school personnel in identifying its needs;
- Identifying programmatic issues that are impacting on teaching and learning;
- Developing an action plan, in conjunction with school and central office staff, to address the major needs identified through the needs assessment process;
- Conducting, or coordinating, professional development activities based on identified needs;
- Increasing the capacity of the school and central office to sustain improvement once services are withdrawn;
- Identifying research-based strategies and programs that will assist schools in improving student achievement; and
- Identifying strategies and initiatives that will assist served schools in narrowing the achievement gaps that may exist.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

#### 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	250
Applied to transfer	250
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	225

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	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	\$ 1,548,997
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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<sup>3</sup> that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

*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.*

<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.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	28,581
Applied for supplemental educational services	6,594
Received supplemental educational services	2,118
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	\$ 4,071,374
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	11,947	7,040	58.9	4,907	41.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1,216	783	64.4	433	35.6
Low-poverty schools	858	517	60.3	341	39.7
All elementary schools	3,007	1,843	61.3	1,164	38.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	847	670	79.1	177	20.9
Low-poverty schools	4,946	2,645	53.5	2,301	46.5
All secondary schools	8,940	5,197	58.1	3,743	41.9
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain 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.

Yes, the State counts one full day self-contained classroom as one class.

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

**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 were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	39.4
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	30.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	30.5
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This response to 1.5.2 includes data from the District of Columbia Public Schools LEA only because Charter LEAs are exempt from state certification requirements.

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

	Percentage
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	35.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	25.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	39.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This response to 1.5.2 includes data from the District of Columbia Public Schools LEA only because Charter LEAs are exempt from state certification requirements.

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

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	82.0	61.0
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	72.0	47.0
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

### 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/expert/glossary.html>.**
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
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Some LEAs did not complete submission of Type of Program data. Data submitted by LEAs after December 19, 2008 will be incorporated during the revision window.

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

## 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. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in 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 in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	5,165
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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 the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	4,147
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 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	3,283
Chinese	127
Vietnamese	100
Amharic	96
French	94

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Some LEAs did not complete submission of Most Commonly Spoken Languages data. Data submitted by LEAs after December 19, 2008 will be incorporated during the revision window.

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,739
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	803
Total	6,542
<b>Comments: The number of LEP students tested on the English Language Proficiency Assessment is derived from the ACCESS for ELLs test file, from the May-June testing window. The total LEP population (5165) data is derived from the audit file, which is used to certify the October enrollment count. Additional LEP students, who were either not enrolled at the time of the audit, not yet assessed, or did not have updated ELP assessment data, participated in the May/June annual ELP assessment.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	883
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	13.5
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,617
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	530
Total	4,147
<b>Comments: The data in 1.6.3.2.2. are derived from the January audit file, which certifies October enrollment data. The data in this element, 1.6.3.2.1. reflect those students who were assessed with the annual ELP assessment in May, and who completed the four domains of the assessment to receive an overall composite proficiency score. 1.6.3.2.1 does not include students from 1.6.3.2.2. who may have withdrawn or transferred prior to the assessment window, or students who participated in the assessment but did not complete all four domains.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, 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.

#### **Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	2,060	62.6
ELP attainment	613	74.3
<b>Comments: These results reflect the students who were in LEAs receiving Title III funds during SY 2007-2008, were in grades K-12, and who had two test scores. Many Title III LEP students are in grades PS, PK and K, and therefore do not have two years of ACCESS for ELLs test score results.</b>		

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



#### 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 NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> Native Language Assessment is not offered in the District of Columbia.

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

#### 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 NCLB accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> Native Language Assessment is not offered in the District of Columbia.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP 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 (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- 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
358	162	520
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 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
326	264	81.0	62
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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
325	268	82.5	57
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (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 into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 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
<b>Comments: The data available for science is aggregated by school level and not by student level; the data provides the number of ELL students that were tested and their proficiency level, but it does not differentiate the monitored former LEP students from the current ELL students.</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 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	5
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	5
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	5
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	1
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 2006-07 and 2007-08)	3
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 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>	

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

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

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

### 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 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 in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III 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 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
993	0	0

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.

During school year 2007-2008 the District of Columbia did not experience a significant increase in immigrant children and youth, but rather experienced a decrease in the number of immigrant children and youth. The District of Columbia received guidance from the U.S. Department of Education on this topic in an e-mail dated May 11, 2006, from Lorena Dickerson. The District of Columbia interpreted the guidance to mean that if a significant increase in immigrant children and youth does not occur (using the formula specified in 3114[d][1]), the funds are to be reallocated. Thus, in school year 2007-2008, the District of Columbia initially reserved 15% for significant increase, in accordance with the requirement of the law, however when it was determined that a decrease had occurred, the 15% of funding was reallocated to eligible entities in accordance with the formula in subsection 3114(a).

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	117
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	0

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.

The number of LEP children in the District of Columbia Public Schools LEA has not been increasing, and teachers in District of Columbia Public Charter Schools are not required to be certified.

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

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

#### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

##### Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	4	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	4	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	4	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	4	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	3	
Other (Explain in comment box)	1	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	3	172
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	4	448
PD provided to principals	4	48

PD provided to administrators/other than principals	4	16
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	4	559
PD provided to community based organization personnel	3	34
Total	4	1,277

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other topics (explain in comment box):

Registrar's Training Diversity Training Bilingual Counselors' Training Multicultural Competencies Training

Some LEAs did not complete submission of Professional Development Activities data. Data submitted by LEAs after December 19, 2008 will be incorporated during the revision window.

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

## 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 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	05/21/08	325
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 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.

Steps to Shorten Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees:

The separation of Title III State and Local functions in the District of Columbia occurred on October 1, 2008, when Title III SEA functions transferred to the newly formed District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education. Transition of functions, consortia formation, and payment processes delayed final Title III allocations.

Moving forward, as part of a large reform effort, both reimbursement procedures, and a reimbursement payment policy have been implemented. This payment process allows subgrantees to submit reimbursement requests on a monthly basis where payments are processed in 30 days. Additionally, the payment process provides several payment options that include direct voucher, Automated Clearing House (ACH) wire transfers and checks.

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

## 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: In the District of Columbia, Schools must report violent crimes to the local police department. Crime analyses that inform the process of identifying persistently dangerous schools are based on data provided by the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department.</b>	

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

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
<b>Comments: Data for subgroup not available yet.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

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 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5.2
Hispanic	4.1
White, non-Hispanic	6.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13.4
Limited English proficient	4.3
Economically disadvantaged	6.8
Migratory students	
Male	5.7
Female	4.6
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.*

### 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	65	65
LEAs with subgrants	0	0
Total	65	65
<b>Comments: 1. DCPS (1) 2. Public Charter Schools (64) The LEA liaison for one school district(LEA) wasn't established for approximately six months. The delay may have impacted data collection efforts with that LEA.</b>		

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

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

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

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	146	
K	145	
1	23	
2	39	
3	30	
4	28	
5	20	
6	30	
7	37	
8	35	
9	22	
10	22	
11	21	
12	20	
Ungraded	387	
Total	1,005	
<b>Comments: PK, ungraded, drop-outs, &amp; unaccompanied youth were sorely undercounted by the LEAs.</b>		

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

#### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	200	
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	754	
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	51	
Hotels/Motels		
Total	1,005	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 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)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	
<p><b>Comments: Though sub grants were not disseminated the children identified were provided transportation assistance, school supplies, awareness materials, and uniforms to eliminate barriers to access schools for identified students through the State Education Agency.</b></p>	

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

#### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	854
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	100
Limited English proficient students	51
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School supplies, coordination between schools and agencies, clothing to meet a school requirement on a case by case basis, staff professional development and awareness, referrals for medical, dental, and other health services, as well as transportation were all provided by the State Educational Agency not through use of subgrants during SY 07-08.

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

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Sub grants were not disseminated and therefore this section does not need to be completed per instruction from USDE. However, transportation continues to be a significant issue as well as LEAs revising their policies and procedures to eliminate barriers to enrollment (eg, residency verification process)

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

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	30	
4	28	
5	20	
6	30	
7	37	
8	35	
High School	75	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	30	
4	28	
5	20	
6	30	
7	37	
8	35	
High School	75	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

## 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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

**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:

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

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

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
<b>Comments: DC SEA currently does not participate in this program.</b>	

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

### **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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in this program.

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

### 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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
<b>Comments: DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.</b>	

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

**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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

### 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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

### 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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

#### 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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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

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.

DC SEA currently does not participate in Migrant Education program.

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