

# 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**

**DELAWARE**



**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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
Delaware Department of Education

Address:  
401 Federal St.  
Dover, DE 19901

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeff Fleming

Telephone: 302-735-4140

Fax: 302-739-4221

e-mail: jfleming@doe.k12.de.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Lillian M. Lowery

Friday, March 13, 2009, 9:32:25 AM

Signature

Date

**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 DOE Curriculum Development workgroup published changes in the Mathematics Standards for grades 9-12. At grades 9-10, the language and terminology of the standards were updated to be consistent with grades K-8 topics. At grades 11-12, extensive reformatting and entirely new grade 12 standards were composed and published following in-depth review by mathematics teachers and specialists. These changes were implemented during school year 2007-2008. (Updated to correct school year)

No changes were made to the DE standards in any other content area.

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 or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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	66,581	65,968	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	209	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,132	2,120	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22,508	22,225	98.7
Hispanic	6,712	6,653	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,020	34,761	99.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,839	9,665	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,650	3,633	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,015	27,801	99.2
Migratory students	23	22	95.6
Male	34,069	33,716	99.0
Female	32,512	32,252	99.2
<b>Comments: The difference is off by one student and this student has been identified as one who had been modified.</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	559	5.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,382	86.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	725	7.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0

Total	9,666	
<b>Comments: The difference is off by one student and this student has been identified as one who had been modified.</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	66,370	65,636	98.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	207	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,064	2,046	99.1
Black, non-Hispanic	22,483	22,166	98.6
Hispanic	6,605	6,521	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	35,011	34,696	99.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,830	9,647	98.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,441	3,401	98.8
Economically disadvantaged students	27,896	27,619	99.0
Migratory students	23	22	95.6
Male	33,963	33,540	98.8
Female	32,407	32,096	99.0
<b>Comments: The difference is off by one student and this student has been identified as one who had been modified.</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	620	6.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,304	86.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	724	7.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	9,648	
<b>Comments: The difference is off by one student and this student has been identified as one who had been modified.</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	36,719	36,036	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	133	131	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,150	1,128	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic	12,253	11,970	98.3
Hispanic	3,449	3,351	97.7
White, non-Hispanic	19,729	19,456	99.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,830	5,495	97.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,611	1,591	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	14,829	14,666	99.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	100.0
Male	18,465	18,245	98.5
Female	18,074	17,791	98.8
<b>Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native -Individuals within this category have varying accomodations which would exclude them from showing on the final counts in 1.3. Migratory Students -have a varying set of accomodations which would exclude them from showing on final counts.</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.

### 1.2.6 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	1,246	22.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,020	73.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	229	4.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	5,495	
<b>Comments: N/A</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.

### **1.3 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	9,556	7,322	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	21	87.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	305	265	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,218	2,016	62.6
Hispanic	1,156	810	70.1
White, non-Hispanic	4,853	4,210	86.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,312	664	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	932	634	68.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,513	2,989	66.2
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,941	3,791	76.7
Female	4,615	3,531	76.5
<p><b>Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.</b></p>			

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.

### 1.3.2.1 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	9,496	7,443	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	22	91.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	288	253	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,214	2,145	66.7
Hispanic	1,126	799	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	4,844	4,224	87.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,310	775	59.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	884	603	68.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,482	3,066	68.4
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,908	3,699	75.4
Female	4,588	3,744	81.6
<p><b>Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.</b></p>			

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.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -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	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: Students not assessed at this grade.</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	9,185	7,033	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	22	68.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	264	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,217	1,998	62.1
Hispanic	1,019	703	69.0
White, non-Hispanic	4,627	4,046	87.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,364	617	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	710	467	65.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,233	2,783	65.7
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,759	3,710	78.0
Female	4,426	3,323	75.1

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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	9,144	7,030	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	27	84.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	283	256	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,210	2,078	64.7
Hispanic	1,001	677	67.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,618	3,992	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,360	682	50.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	678	418	61.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,208	2,767	65.8
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,734	3,554	75.1
Female	4,410	3,476	78.8

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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	9,273	8,384	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	29	87.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	296	277	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,230	2,723	84.3
Hispanic	1,035	870	84.1
White, non-Hispanic	4,679	4,485	95.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,631	1,319	80.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	672	569	84.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,396	3,861	87.8
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,805	4,332	90.2
Female	4,468	4,052	90.7
<b>Comments: The fourth grade students are assessed in the fall on K-3 standards.</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	9,072	6,909	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	24	80.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	321	304	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,057	1,904	62.3
Hispanic	968	675	69.7
White, non-Hispanic	4,696	4,002	85.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,463	637	43.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	599	379	63.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,075	2,647	65.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,702	3,580	76.1
Female	4,370	3,329	76.2

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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	9,041	7,384	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	28	93.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	308	287	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,057	2,166	70.9
Hispanic	953	699	73.3
White, non-Hispanic	4,693	4,204	89.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,462	803	54.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	566	363	64.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,060	2,907	71.6
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,682	3,704	79.1
Female	4,359	3,680	84.4

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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

	# 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 5</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: Students not tested at this grade</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

<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	9,287	6,914	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	23	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	284	264	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,025	1,773	58.6
Hispanic	966	672	69.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,978	4,182	84.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,398	530	37.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	423	254	60.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,994	2,503	62.7
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,680	3,479	74.3
Female	4,607	3,435	74.6

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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

<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	9,244	7,063	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	25	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	279	254	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,013	1,962	65.1
Hispanic	949	624	65.8
White, non-Hispanic	4,969	4,198	84.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,393	609	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	396	206	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,966	2,578	65.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,663	3,335	71.5
Female	4,581	3,728	81.4

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	8,992	8,086	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	24	92.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	294	270	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,015	2,492	82.7
Hispanic	948	782	82.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,709	4,518	95.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,483	722	48.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	400	311	77.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,711	3,120	84.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	4,629	4,168	90.0
Female	4,363	3,918	89.8
<b>Comments: Students in sixth grade are assessed in fall at 4-5 standards</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	9,574	6,515	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	18	58.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	277	253	91.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,288	1,686	51.3
Hispanic	947	582	61.5
White, non-Hispanic	5,031	3,976	79.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,487	474	31.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	354	149	42.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,055	2,190	54.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,981	3,359	67.4
Female	4,593	3,156	68.7

**Comments: Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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	9,538	7,728	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	25	80.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	270	246	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,287	2,328	70.8
Hispanic	924	690	74.7
White, non-Hispanic	5,026	4,439	88.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,490	709	47.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	320	174	54.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,030	2,887	71.6
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,966	3,796	76.4
Female	4,572	3,932	86.0

**Comments: Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	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: Students are not assessed at seventh grade for 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.**

### 1.3.1.6 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	10,323	6,673	64.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	25	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	327	291	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,627	1,697	46.8
Hispanic	940	501	53.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,395	4,159	77.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,531	423	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	364	143	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,210	2,064	49.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	5,224	3,391	64.9
Female	5,099	3,282	64.4

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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	10,263	7,865	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	29	90.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	316	282	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,614	2,315	64.1
Hispanic	919	614	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,382	4,625	85.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,523	576	37.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	328	140	42.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,177	2,676	64.1
Migratory students	N<15	0	
Male	5,191	3,786	72.9
Female	5,072	4,079	80.4

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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	10,309	5,505	53.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	20	62.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	332	247	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,628	1,154	31.8
Hispanic	931	350	37.6
White, non-Hispanic	5,386	3,734	69.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,499	721	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	357	67	18.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,164	1,429	34.3
Migratory students	N<15	0	
Male	5,223	2,819	54.0
Female	5,086	2,686	52.8
<b>Comments:</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	8,972	5,212	58.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	N<15	58.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	315	264	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2,793	1,042	37.3
Hispanic	657	303	46.1
White, non-Hispanic	5,183	3,589	69.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,113	273	24.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	251	92	36.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,721	1,100	40.4
Migratory students	N<15	0	
Male	4,431	2,627	59.3
Female	4,541	2,585	56.9

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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	8,917	6,115	68.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	17	70.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	304	251	82.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2,772	1,446	52.2
Hispanic	651	332	51.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,166	4,069	78.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,112	319	28.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	234	59	25.2
Economically disadvantaged students	2,698	1,376	51.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,399	2,882	65.5
Female	4,518	3,233	71.6

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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

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	7,783	4,537	58.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	20	60.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	243	181	74.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,345	859	36.6
Hispanic	494	213	43.1
White, non-Hispanic	4,668	3,264	69.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	882	139	15.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	179	47	26.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,074	816	39.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,893	2,297	59.0
Female	3,890	2,240	57.6
<b>Comments:</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	191	136	71.2
Districts	19	13	68.4
<b>Comments:</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	90	72	80.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	53	43	81.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	37	29	78.4
<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
19	13	68.4
<b>Comments:</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	0
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
<b>Comments: Corrective action sites select a combination of strategies (ex: outside expert and replacement of principal).</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)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
<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.

The school opted to restructure its daily schedule, its use of time, interventions and staff responsibilities  
 Revise the school internal schedule and responsibilities of staff  
 Revised the time to allow building wide blocks of time for literacy and math

## 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.

Delaware has 6 districts identified for improvement, two are in year two (both made academic progress in 07-08), and none are in corrective action.

The districts receive support from Delaware Educational Support System including:

- Written notification of AYP status and guidance related to the accountability sanctions/requirements
- Over federal and state consolidated resources which are to be used to address needs
- Direct assistance regarding the implementation of the requirements/sanctions and use of resources to build capacity
- Delaware Department of Education staff members assigned to the LEA as liaisons to provide support in developing LEA capacity to implement continuous improvement strategies that have the greatest likelihood in meeting needs.
- Access to school improvement experts (Facilitators, Distinguished Educators, etc.) who focus on research, leadership, and reform issues to assist LEAS in addressing barriers and identified needs including (not limited to) curricular alignment, strategy selection and the scheduling of interventions, access and use of data to inform decisions, and other areas to address needs

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments: No district in corrective action -this is not applicable.</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	7	3
Schools	19	9
<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	07/13/08
---	----------

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	6,184	4,981
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	2,631	2,236
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	42.5	44.9
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	2,681	2,154
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	43.4	43.2
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	9	
<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.

#### 1.4.8.2 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	3
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	5
<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	LEAs received direct support from a cadre of facilitators who worked directly with local offices in developing their capacity to address issues related to improvement, including (not limited to) identifying appropriate restructuring options, reviewing data, leadership challenges	9	0	3	A	None
3	Schools developed strategies to effectively use teacher planning time and provide supports for students related to needs. The use of time and staff expertise was shared with other LEAs	4	0	2	D	Teachers are able to discuss student work and address needs in a collegial /clinical fashion and students needs are met with targeted multi-sensory interventions
4	SEA/LEA teams worked together to review data, learn how to engage LEAs in improvement work, build partnerships, and model successful strategies	9	0	3	D	Creating a more focused system of statewide support
2	schools selecting classroom environment (management) strategies to assist the teacher in delivering the content and tracking growth	5	0	2	D	teachers able to manage th instruction and deliver appropriate interventions

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Delaware Education Support System (DESS) convenes sessions, both in person and on the web, to share effective practices and growth within the state. In addition, staff members assigned to the LEA as liaisons communicate effective practices to other LEAs. The school improvement experts (Facilitators, Distinguished Educators, etc.) also meet monthly, and share their experiences in a collegial fashion with DDOE staff and other professionals -providing opportunities for feedback, exploration, and replication.

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: None**

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

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

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

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

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 1003 funds are targeted to the needs of identified students as per Delaware Department of Education's accountability system. The purpose of the 1003(a) funds is to aid LEAs in developing the capacity to use data to adequately address the challenges that prevent students from achieving and result in the LEA being identified for improvement. Allowable uses include:

- Long range Planning
- Ongoing, sustained High Quality Professional Development
- Stipends for staff (and especially for HQT who attend professional development training) and consultants
- Costs associated with any instructional strategy designed to improve academic achievement
- Costs associated with meeting HQT requirements (Praxis II, paraprofessional testing and support)
- Costs associated with strategies to address other barriers to achievement (poor attendance, parental engagement, etc.), as long as these costs are aligned with academic improvement goals.
- Costs associated with materials or resources that have a research base for addressing the root causes of targeted pupil academic needs

The SEA has determined amounts for schools that are eligible to receive Title I Part a resources and those who are not (eligible). The 1003

(a) resources are used only by LEAs that have Title I programs; however the SEA provides a supplement to non Title I LEAs and to Title I LEAs (a Title I LEA will get both 1003 and state school improvement resources). Upon notification of AYP status, the LEA applies for their pre-determined grant award amount. The activities must support the District/board-approved plan. The SEA convenes a team to review the LEA plan for compliance and strategy alignment, as well as the use of resources. The SEA approves the resources and offers suggested amendments (as needed).

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.

- Delaware Department of Education staff members are assigned to the LEA as liaisons to provide support in developing LEA capacity to implement continuous improvement strategies that have the greatest likelihood in meeting needs.
- Schools can access external school improvement experts to focus on research, leadership, and reform issues to assist LEAS in addressing barriers and identified needs including (not limited to) curricular alignment, strategy selection and the scheduling of interventions, access and use of data to inform decisions, and other areas to address needs
- The SEA spends a focused amount of resources to support schools in corrective action and restructuring to assist with strategy selection, needs assessment, resource usage and operational support.
- The state provides an additional \$5,000 in state resources to each Title I School in improvement

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	6,040
Applied to transfer	179
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	179

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	No

**Comments: Comments: It must be noted that two LEAs, Positive Outcomes Charter and Marion T. academy Charter attempted to enter into agreements with their neighboring districts and both were denied. Also, Delcastle THS participated in the SES Pilot and made AYP (frozen at offering SES in year 1). The other vocational school Howard High School of Technology, as with all career-technical schools, offers specific programs that students receive only at that school. By nature, career-technical schools are schools of choice, and students are hesitant to leave schools that have their selected career pathway. The vocational schools account for over 2300 of the eligible choice students. NCCVT did not feel that the Pilot was impacting a large number of pupils and did not wish to continue -they are a career technical district that has families choice to them and to specific schools based on career programs and therefore did not feel that they would lose large numbers of children due to choice (NCLB). Lastly, Delaware has a state choice program where applications for schools are accepted in the winter and students are admitted based on numerous factors (space, geography, sibling, etc.) families who have choice into particular schools may not wish to leave regardless of the designation.**

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

### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 102,952
<b>Comments:</b> .	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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	4
<b>Comments:</b> Comments: 1) It must be noted that two LEAs, Positive Outcomes Charter and Marion T. academy Charter attempted to enter into agreements with their neighboring districts and both were denied. They are charters and by nature are designed where "all schools at a grade level are in improvement." 2) Also, Delcastle THS participated in the SES Pilot and made AYP (frozen at offering SES in year 1). The other vocational school Howard High School of Technology, as with all career-technical schools, offers specific programs that students receive only at that school. By nature, career-technical schools are schools of choice, and students were hesitant to leave schools that have their selected career pathway. They have the option to choice to the two other schools in the Vocational School District, which have standard educational programs, but all four have unique career-technical programs, and students select their school (initially) based on their career focus.	

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

### FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?*

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and<sup>3</sup>
- 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	3,561
Applied for supplemental educational services	407
Received supplemental educational services	407
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 109,098
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	19,762	18,022	91.2	1,740	8.8
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	802	742	92.5	60	7.5
Low-poverty schools	789	767	97.2	22	2.8
All elementary schools	3,252	3,128	96.2	124	3.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	2,281	1,822	79.9	459	20.1
Low-poverty schools	3,971	3,656	92.1	315	7.9
All secondary schools	16,510	14,894	90.2	1,616	9.8
<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.

Delaware counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals 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
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	29.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	8.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	18.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	45.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other reasons" for elementary classes not being taught by a highly qualified teacher are the following.

- (1) The teacher's unique identifier through the State personnel system has not been entered into the database linked to the electronic Teacher Quality Survey or the identifier is not found in the database.
- (2) The teacher's certificate is not yet issued or the teacher does not have the appropriate specialty certificate required for the class (e.g., special education, ESL, bilingual).

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	44.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	15.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	19.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other reasons" for secondary classes not being taught by a highly qualified teacher are the following.

- (1) The teacher's unique identifier through the State personnel system has not been entered into the database linked to the electronic Teacher Quality Survey or the identifier is not found in the database.
- (2) The teacher's certificate is not yet issued, or the teacher does not have the appropriate specialty certificate required for the class (e.g., special education, ESL, bilingual), or the teacher does not have a certificate that matches the subject matter of the class.
- (3) No core academic subject was specified for the class in the database linked to the electronic Teacher Quality Survey.

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	59.0	32.6
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced lunch participation	
Secondary schools	47.2	23.3
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced lunch participation	
<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
No	Two-way immersion	NA
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	NA
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	6,831
<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.	6,756
<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	5,287
Creole	260
Chinese	133
Gujarati	108
Korean	100

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

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	6,710
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	109
Total	6,819
<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.

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3,621
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	53.1
<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.

### 1.6.3.2.1 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.

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,583
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	83
Total	6,666
<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.

### 1.6.3.2.2 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.**

	<b>Results</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	2,859	94.0
ELP attainment	678	96.5
<b>Comments: The data is correct. The numbers have been checked and verified.</b>		

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

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
<b>Comments:</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)
none
<b>Comments:</b> Delaware does not provide reading/language arts in another language.

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)
Spanish
<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.

### 1.6.3.6 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
453	145	598
<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
235	202	86.0	33
<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
235	206	87.7	29
<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
209	193	92.3	16
<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.

### 1.6.4 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	16
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	15
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	16
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	16
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	15
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)	1
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<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	No
<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
1,164	222	3

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.

Delaware had 3 LEAs that met the state's significant increase definition. Delaware uses 1% of the funds for immigrant program. These students are also served through the Title III instructional programs.

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.	123
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	150

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.

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:

- Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
- # 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.)**
- Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.**
- Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	3	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	3	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	1	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	1	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	2	
Other (Explain in comment box)	2	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	2	100
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	4	8
PD provided to principals	2	12
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	1	6
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	2	6

PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	26
Total	12	158

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District 13 -Penn TESOL -East: TransCultural & Translingual Living by Cath Bao Bean District 24  
-Best Practices for Teaching Literacy to ESL Students

The number is significantly less from 2006-07 due to LEAS not entering any data into the state database; or not providing as many professional development days as the previous year.

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
07/01/08	8/1/08	30
<b>Comments: Districts apply in July, August or September through the Consolidated Application and receive the money within 30 days after the final approval of the grant. If the districts apply in July, they receive the funds by August 1. If the districts apply in August, they receive the funds by September 1. If the districts apply in September, they receive the funds by October 1.</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.

Delaware is reviewing the process at this time to shorten the process.

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:</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	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	82.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	75.0
Hispanic	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	85.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	66.0
Limited English proficient	54.0
Economically disadvantaged	70.0
Migratory students	60.0
Male	78.0
Female	84.0

**Comments: The graduation rate is calculated using a cohort of 9th grade students following them over a 4 year period. Because this rate is different from the rate used for calculating the dropout rate, it is not expected to equal 100%.**

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	5.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.2
Black, non-Hispanic	7.0
Hispanic	8.5
White, non-Hispanic	4.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.5
Limited English proficient	7.4
Economically disadvantaged	5.2
Migratory students	11.1
Male	6.3
Female	4.5
<b>Comments: The dropout rate is calculated by taking a 1-year snapshot rate. Because this rate is different from the rate used for calculating the graduation rate, it is not expected to equal 100%.</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	6	6
LEAs with subgrants	13	13
Total	19	19
<b>Comments:</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)	0	0
K	44	143
1	42	168
2	22	144
3	28	153
4	26	113
5	29	136
6	21	119
7	14	123
8	25	161
9	27	151
10	12	105
11	15	67
12	10	84
Ungraded	0	0
Total	315	1,667
<b>Comments:</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	130	638
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	163	859
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<15	0
Hotels/Motels	21	170
Total	315	1,667
<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)	0
K	143
1	168
2	144
3	153
4	113
5	136
6	119
7	123
8	161
9	151
10	105
11	67
12	84
Ungraded	0
Total	1,667
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	38
Migratory children/youth	N<15
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	406
Limited English proficient students	65
<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	7
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	2
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	13
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	9
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	10
Counseling	9
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	9
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	8
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	131	90
4	105	59
5	121	69
6	101	63
7	96	61
8	137	76
High School	73	27
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	135	81
4	105	61
5	121	60
6	106	57
7	96	41
8	141	45
High School	74	21
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	N<15
1	N<15
2	N<15
3	N<15
4	N<15
5	N<15
6	N<15
7	N<15
8	N<15
9	N<15
10	N<15
11	N<15
12	N<15
Ungraded	16
Out-of-school	21
Total	133
<b>Comments:</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.

The 2007-08 Category 1 numbers were less due to one or more of the following contributing factors:

- a. Loss of farmland;
- b. Closing of several migrant camps within the last 2 years;
- c. Existing camps have fewer children;
- d. 3-year eligibility ended and not enough new families were found who were eligible;
- e. Not including poultry workers unless they are employed with a temporary agency. This is due to the lack of industrial surveys or data supporting jobs that are temporary;
- f. Delaware was declared a natural disaster area by the USDA beginning June 15, 2008 for this season's drought.

Poultry workers are not eligible without documentation that work is temporary. Delaware proves temporary work status by a statement from the worker and/or a statement from a temporary agency that the worker is employed by; e.g., Staff Mark used by Seawatch, a seafood plant.

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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<15
K	N<15
1	N<15
2	N<15
3	N<15
4	N<15
5	0
6	N<15
7	0
8	N<15
9	N<15
10	N<15
11	N<15
12	0
Ungraded	15
Out-of-school	0
Total	40
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

The 2007-08 Category 2 numbers were slightly less due to one or more of the following reasons:

- a. fewer eligible students;
- b. unable to transport students from remote areas to the summer program due to fewer children and transportation costs;
- c. more students working.

The Child Count in Sussex County decreased significantly making transportation for 10 students to be used from the western part of the county to the program in the eastern part of the county not cost effective.

The State is in the process of making changes in how it will be serving migrant students in Sussex County due to the decrease in numbers. The changes will become operational in July 2009.

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. \

Delaware used NGS and Delaware's state database DELSIS for Category 1 and 2 for 2007-08 and the previous reporting year 2006-07.

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.

Category 1 data was collected through a report run using NGS. NGS is the student information system used for the state of Delaware's Migrant Education Program. All eligible migrant students are entered into NGS. Identification and Recruitment is an on-going process that occurs year round. Once a student is recruited and a COE is initially completed it is turned in to the data entry person who crosschecks the information against the state database DELSIS, (Delaware Student Information System), and NGS to check for accuracy and avoid duplications. (In the case of children birth through 5 and out-of-school youth it is not applicable to crosscheck DELSIS.) Data included on the COE is student's name, parents' names, address, date of birth, race, gender, grade, and additional academic information that includes the categories to identify students as PFS.

Reports are run and reviewed periodically--monthly--to ensure the records are kept up to date and valid. Also lists of students are sent to each district in the fall for them to verify enrollment. In the case of migrant students recruited during SY 2007-2008 who have years of eligibility remaining, manual data collection is used. Residency verifications are done by the state recruiter by phone or by home visits to ensure the students are present in the state and their qualifying status is unchanged. This is done for students in DELSIS and for those not in enrolled in DELSIS. After September 1st the state recruiter connects with every child not enrolled in a public school to confirm or update their status. This is also for eligible migrant students who are not enrolled in DELSIS.

Category 2 data is collected in a similar manner. All eligible migrant students are invited to participate in the 2 summer programs. Each program director keeps records on every student regarding attendance, course work and supplemental services. At the end of the summer program in early to mid August of 2008 the records are submitted to the SEA and verified by the state recruiter based on daily/weekly site visits made to the programs. The information is then given to the data entry person who also does another verification per email and phone call if information looks questionable or incomplete. Upon her satisfaction the data is entered into NGS.

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.

The recruiter turns in COEs to the migrant data entry person who inputs the data into NGS. Data for child counts are checked for accuracy in DELSIS and then the necessary information is entered into NGS. DELSIS only keeps information on pre-school students who are being served in special programs. Only the school-age student data come directly from DELSIS. However all data on migrant children identified in Delaware are entered into the NGS system. DELSIS provides the school information and is used to crosscheck eligible migrant students which makes child counts more accurate. During the year the migrant data entry person requests reports from NGS to determine migrant students for the reporting period. This data in NGS is crosschecked with school lists to verify accuracy. At the end of the summer programs in early to mid August academic and health information are turned into the data entry person to be entered into NGS.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 and 2 are collected in the same way.

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.

When a COE is turned in by the recruiter each student is checked in DELSIS to verify the school, grade, race, and birth date for accuracy. Then the student is checked both in DELSIS and NGS to ensure child counts are correct. Each student is only counted once even if the student has attended several schools during the reporting year. Summer program child counts are done using the time period that the summer school programs are in operation--July-August. All data is entered in NGS, as well as health data if applicable.

The recruiter supplies the information when a student is either pre-school age or is not currently attending school.

Delaware keeps a last qualifying move (LQM) date list. Both the migrant data entry person and the recruiter use the list to ensure only those migrant students who are currently eligible are counted. When a child turns three years of age they are counted if they are still here. Delaware only counts ages 3 to 21 years when their LQM date falls in the 3-year eligibility range. Students who are residents are confirmed by the recruiter through home visits telephone calls to the family or school personnel.

After the verification process is completed the count is pulled from NGS.

Delaware didn't have an intersession term for the reporting year of 2007-08 but had two summer programs. The two summer programs were held after the close of the regular school year--July-August. The child count for category 2 is done by requesting a report from NGS for students enrolled for that time period and school codes for the two sites which held summer migrant programs. The two summer migrant programs turn in forms which include attendance, supplemental program assistance, credit accrual and health screenings.

Only students for category 2 who actually attended the summer migrant program are included in the category 2 child count. To ensure that students are not previously enrolled under another name we do a crosscheck using birth date parent's name place of birth. A check for possible duplicates is done at the initial time of entering the child in NGS. When the recruiter turns in a COE a check is done in DELSIS using the mother's last name and father's last name to verify the information. Sometimes when the student was entered into DELSIS the mother's last name was used and sometimes the father's last name was used. The age and race are also checked. If a student has the same birth date the parent's name race grade and the school they are attending match then the data is entered in NGS. If there are discrepancies further follow-up is done by the recruiters or the migrant data entry person calls the schools. The recruiter makes contact with the families when there is a discrepancy. The migrant data entry person makes calls to schools to determine if the migrant student is attending their school and gets information to confirm the data.

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.

Category 1 and 2 are collected in the same way.

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.

The state of Delaware takes all reasonable and practical steps to ensure that proper eligibility determinations and verifications are made despite our limited capacity. Delaware provides 2 national training sessions annually for its state recruiter to ensure she is up to date with the newest regulations. Once the recruiter has identified a family and determined they are eligible a COE is completed. The recruiter asks for records such as a birth certificate, school records, or driver's license whenever possible. The recruiter is trained to be thorough and review information with the family. Once the COE is completed at the time of the interview, it is given the next day to the data entry person who reviews the information with the eligibility criteria in mind and then entered into NGS within 2-5 days upon receipt. The information is also crosschecked with DELSIS, the state database and NGS. This helps to eliminate duplicates and ensure accurate data collection. The process takes from 7-10 days from the time the recruiter identifies families and completes the COE to the entering of the data into NGS and DELSIS.

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.

Delaware is

- a. continuing to provide more training opportunities for the State recruiter and data entry person and summer migrant staff;
- b. continuing to improve the re-interview process to ensure accuracy of the COE information and eligibility of the migrant families;  
and
- c. continuing to improve the quality control procedures.

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.

Throughout the year migrant students are recruited and enrolled and school lists are updated. Students are checked in DELSIS to verify that the migrant students are in the correct schools. Then school lists are requested from NGS and comparisons are made to make sure the information is the same. In addition the state recruiter and data entry person work together as a system of checks and balances to ensure all data is maintained accurately on a monthly basis.

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.

Once the 2 summer schools end around mid August, the data entry person takes the state's final steps to ensure accuracy by manually checking the data. The recruiter in September reviews the COEs. This is the catch all method to review and verify that all students are eligible. We review the following scenarios: residency, age (turning 3 or turning 22), and remaining years of eligibility. A combination of DELSIS searches and home visits ensures accurate reporting.

The Delaware COE, at the present time, has the required data elements and is standardized. Delaware will revise the COE, as needed, once the OME has made a decision on a National COE.

The State Director reviews every COE for accuracy once it is finalized by the recruiter and the data entry person.

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.

Delaware is currently in the process of improving its overall Identification and Recruitment and Quality Control processes to meet the new regulations. A new ID & R Manual is currently being edited.

The recruiter will continue to receive at least two national training sessions annually.

Delaware is conducting the required re-interviewing with outside interviewers at this time. The results will be sent to OME in spring 2009.

Every year Delaware will re-interview a random sampling of students to verify eligibility and every 3 years re-interview by using outside

interviewers.

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.

Delaware has no concerns at this time.

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