

# 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**

**HAWAII**



**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 EDFacts 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).

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:

Hawaii

Address:

P.O. Box 2360

Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Cara Tanimura

Telephone: (808) 586-3283

Fax: (808) 586-3440

e-mail: cara\_tanimura@notes.k12.hi.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Cara Tanimura

\_\_\_\_\_  
Wednesday, April 1, 2009, 4:44:19 PM

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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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.

Hawaii Department of Education is in a Compliance Agreement with the USDOE. Hawaii DOE Systems Accountability Student Assessment Section has begun the process of developing a new/ revised Hawaii State Alternate Assessment (HSAA) for the content areas of reading, mathematics, and science. The following timeline outlines our proposed time frame for implementation of a new/ revised HSAA operational test during the spring of 2011.

\*November/ December 2008 -develop an RFP for HSAA that meets technical qualities and provides student access to the general education curriculum and develops a meaningful/ useful alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities - released for bidders to submit proposals/ review committee assembled to review proposals submitted

- \* January 2009 -Review/ award contract for HSAA
- \* January 2009 -begin development of items for operational field test in reading and mathematics
- \* March 2009 -reviews of new field test items for reading and mathematics for operational field test
- \* April/ May 2009 -administration of HSAA operational field test for HSAA
- \* June/ July 2009 -score administration of HSAA operational field test for reading and mathematics
- \* July/ August 2009 -standard setting to set cut-scores/ proficiency levels for new HSAA reading and mathematics -develop performance level descriptors (PLD)
- \* August 2009 -February 2010 -development of new items and assemble committees to review items for reading, mathematics 2010 operational test
- \* February/ March 2010 -develop operational test for HSAA reading and mathematics and field test for science
- \* April 2010 -administer operational test for HSAA reading and mathematics
- \* June/ July 2010 -score administration of operational test for HSAA reading and mathematics
- \* August 2010 -alignment study for the operational test for the HSAA reading and mathematics
- \* August 2010 -develop plan to address gaps identified in the alignment study
- \* August 2010 -conduct item data reviews to assure fairness of items for all subgroups for HSAA reading and mathematics operational test
- \* August 2010/ January 2011 -develop items for operational and field tests for reading and mathematics
- \* November 2010/ January 2011 -conduct item reviews for content and bias for operational and field tests for reading and mathematics
- \* Spring 2011 -implementation of operational for HSAA for reading and mathematics

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

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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	93,562	92,303	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	559	550	98.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	74,352	73,392	98.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,209	2,178	98.6
Hispanic	2,981	2,932	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,461	13,251	98.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,442	10,023	96.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,374	8,213	98.1
Economically disadvantaged students	39,798	39,246	98.6
Migratory students	372	365	98.1
Male	48,377	47,661	98.5
Female	45,185	44,642	98.8
<b>Comments: 1228 -absent</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. 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	3,853	38.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,736	57.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	434	4.3
Total	10,023	

**Comments: 419 -absent**

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	93,562	92,334	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	559	552	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	74,352	73,419	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2,209	2,177	98.6
Hispanic	2,981	2,935	98.5
White, non-Hispanic	13,461	13,251	98.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,442	10,042	96.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,374	8,226	98.2
Economically disadvantaged students	39,798	39,254	98.6
Migratory students	372	364	97.9
Male	48,377	47,672	98.5
Female	45,185	44,662	98.8
<b>Comments: 1259 -absent</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	3,821	38.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,786	57.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	435	4.3
Total	10,042	
<b>Comments: 400 -absent</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	39,423	37,392	94.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	212	191	90.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	31,328	29,669	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	897	840	93.6
Hispanic	1,200	1,119	93.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,786	5,399	93.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,455	3,933	88.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,250	3,040	93.5
Economically disadvantaged students	15,311	14,340	93.7
Migratory students	150	144	96.0
Male	20,455	19,291	94.3
Female	18,968	18,090	95.4
<b>Comments: 174 ethnic group not identified in database</b>			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	35,775	95.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,616	4.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	128	0.3
Total	37,519	
<b>Comments: 2187 -ABSENT</b>		

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

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

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

	# 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 3</b>			
All students	13,669	7,192	52.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	105	52	49.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,805	5,476	50.7
Black, non-Hispanic	343	167	48.7
Hispanic	481	220	45.7
White, non-Hispanic	1,935	1,277	66.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,293	187	14.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,644	459	27.9
Economically disadvantaged students	6,151	2,505	40.7
Migratory students	62	14	22.6
Male	7,153	3,683	51.5
Female	6,516	3,509	53.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# 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 3</b>			
All students	13,673	8,466	61.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	105	63	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,809	6,479	59.9
Black, non-Hispanic	343	210	61.2
Hispanic	481	279	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	1,935	1,435	74.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,295	196	15.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,646	537	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	6,151	3,051	49.6
Migratory students	62	18	29.0
Male	7,155	3,998	55.9
Female	6,518	4,468	68.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# 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 3</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Hawaii does not administer the Science assessment in Grade 3</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

	# 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 4</b>			
All students	13,492	6,605	49.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	95	40	42.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,685	5,129	48.0
Black, non-Hispanic	352	133	37.8
Hispanic	423	168	39.7
White, non-Hispanic	1,937	1,135	58.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,338	176	13.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,411	314	22.3
Economically disadvantaged students	6,003	2,228	37.1
Migratory students	53	15	28.3
Male	6,936	3,209	46.3
Female	6,556	3,396	51.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# 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 4</b>			
All students	13,491	8,284	61.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	95	56	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,686	6,341	59.3
Black, non-Hispanic	352	212	60.2
Hispanic	423	240	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	1,935	1,435	74.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,337	207	15.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,411	387	27.4
Economically disadvantaged students	6,000	2,964	49.4
Migratory students	53	20	37.7
Male	6,937	3,788	54.6
Female	6,554	4,496	68.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

	# 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 4</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: Hawaii does not administer the Science assessment in grade 4</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

	# 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	13,347	5,874	44.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	26	40.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,497	4,507	42.9
Black, non-Hispanic	321	98	30.5
Hispanic	465	134	28.8
White, non-Hispanic	1,999	1,109	55.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,457	134	9.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,183	186	15.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,847	1,900	32.5
Migratory students	53	13	24.5
Male	6,893	2,958	42.9
Female	6,454	2,916	45.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -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	13,347	7,573	56.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	44	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,497	5,702	54.3
Black, non-Hispanic	320	172	53.8
Hispanic	465	211	45.4
White, non-Hispanic	2,000	1,444	72.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,458	219	15.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,183	232	19.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,848	2,583	44.2
Migratory students	53	16	30.2
Male	6,893	3,603	52.3
Female	6,454	3,970	61.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.3 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	13,245	6,514	49.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	40	58.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,385	4,766	45.9
Black, non-Hispanic	316	132	41.8
Hispanic	466	182	39.1
White, non-Hispanic	2,009	1,394	69.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,352	153	11.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,260	161	12.8
Economically disadvantaged students	5,650	1,996	35.3
Migratory students	51	11	21.6
Male	6,841	3,370	49.3
Female	6,404	3,144	49.1
<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.**

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	13,283	5,592	42.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	22	31.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,528	4,342	41.2
Black, non-Hispanic	290	106	36.6
Hispanic	426	136	31.9
White, non-Hispanic	1,968	986	50.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,406	129	9.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,131	178	15.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,836	1,754	30.1
Migratory students	52	N<10	
Male	6,847	2,685	39.2
Female	6,436	2,907	45.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	13,285	7,592	57.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	38	53.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,529	5,719	54.3
Black, non-Hispanic	291	186	63.9
Hispanic	426	229	53.8
White, non-Hispanic	1,968	1,420	72.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,407	201	14.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,131	202	17.9
Economically disadvantaged students	5,834	2,569	44.0
Migratory students	52	14	26.9
Male	6,847	3,511	51.3
Female	6,438	4,081	63.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	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: Hawaii does not administer science assessment in Grade 6</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

	# 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 7</b>			
All students	12,829	5,161	40.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	26	39.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,263	4,012	39.1
Black, non-Hispanic	326	136	41.7
Hispanic	365	115	31.5
White, non-Hispanic	1,809	872	48.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,459	110	7.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,021	140	13.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,526	1,566	28.3
Migratory students	49	N<10	
Male	6,581	2,508	38.1
Female	6,248	2,653	42.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -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
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	12,836	8,256	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	41	62.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,269	6,381	62.1
Black, non-Hispanic	325	232	71.4
Hispanic	366	227	62.0
White, non-Hispanic	1,810	1,375	76.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,461	263	18.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,024	247	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5,529	2,902	52.5
Migratory students	49	12	24.5
Male	6,585	3,797	57.7
Female	6,251	4,459	71.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -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
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	12,722	4,708	37.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	26	36.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,149	3,472	34.2
Black, non-Hispanic	318	117	36.8
Hispanic	369	124	33.6
White, non-Hispanic	1,815	969	53.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,360	70	5.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,027	61	5.9
Economically disadvantaged students	5,370	1,256	23.4
Migratory students	46	N<10	
Male	6,493	2,302	35.5
Female	6,229	2,406	38.6
<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.**

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

	# 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 8</b>			
All students	13,186	4,589	34.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	28	33.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,597	3,589	33.9
Black, non-Hispanic	301	91	30.2
Hispanic	421	114	27.1
White, non-Hispanic	1,784	767	43.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,532	93	6.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	902	99	11.0
Economically disadvantaged students	5,479	1,331	24.3
Migratory students	51	N<10	
Male	6,785	2,143	31.6
Female	6,401	2,446	38.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# 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 8</b>			
All students	13,198	8,649	65.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	84	61	72.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,609	6,744	63.6
Black, non-Hispanic	301	197	65.4
Hispanic	422	265	62.8
White, non-Hispanic	1,782	1,382	77.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,538	280	18.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	910	182	20.0
Economically disadvantaged students	5,486	2,914	53.1
Migratory students	50	20	40.0
Male	6,793	4,006	59.0
Female	6,405	4,643	72.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

	# 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 8</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: Hawaii does not administer the science assessment in grade 8</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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	12,497	4,259	34.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	21	32.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,017	3,324	33.2
Black, non-Hispanic	245	73	29.8
Hispanic	351	95	27.1
White, non-Hispanic	1,819	746	41.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,538	58	3.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	921	130	14.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,404	1,027	23.3
Migratory students	45	N<10	
Male	6,466	2,047	31.7
Female	6,031	2,212	36.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	12,504	8,436	67.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	45	68.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,020	6,606	65.9
Black, non-Hispanic	245	171	69.8
Hispanic	352	226	64.2
White, non-Hispanic	1,821	1,388	76.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,546	298	19.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	921	293	31.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,406	2,431	55.2
Migratory students	45	20	44.4
Male	6,462	3,871	59.9
Female	6,042	4,565	75.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -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
<b>High School</b>			
All students	11,408	3,031	26.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	N<10	13.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,241	2,285	24.7
Black, non-Hispanic	211	50	23.7
Hispanic	297	61	20.5
White, non-Hispanic	1,608	628	39.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,224	45	3.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	783	47	6.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,513	549	15.6
Migratory students	46	N<10	
Male	5,953	1,657	27.8
Female	5,455	1,374	25.2
<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	283	119	42.1
Districts	1		
<b>Comments: Data checked and verified.</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	183	65	35.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	160	57	35.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	23	8	34.8
<b>Comments: Data checked and verified.</b>			

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

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Hawaii is a SEA/LEA.</b>		

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

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

## 1.4.4 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	12
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	12
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
<b>Comments: Data is accurate as reported.</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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	48
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<b>Comments: Data is accurate as reported.</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.

Other major restructuring of the school governance is not applicable.

## 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.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable: Hawaii is a SEA/LEA.

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	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
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)	
<b>Comments: Hawaii has a single educational system. It is an SEA/LEA.</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	0	0
Schools	31	7
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	08/30/08
---	----------

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	14,726	14,833
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	5,031	4,387
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	34.2	29.6
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	8,689	8,446
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	59.0	56.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	36	
<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	2
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	33
<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>
6 = Combo 1 8 = Combo 3	The numbers reflect Strategy 1, 2, 3, and 4. There are no "other strategies".	89	14	23	D	Schools making AYP or gaining unconditional status.
<b>Comments: Data is accurate as reported.</b>						

#### Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

#### **1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State has shared the effective strategies with its schools primarily through its yearly training of school administrators and complex area personnel on the Hawaii Department of Education Framework for School Improvement, a manual on the accountability and support systems for NCLB status schools. Also, the State hosts an annual Professional Services Provider Conferences on school improvement providers. In addition, the State has done presentations for the Title I Linkers who work directly with schools in their complex areas, and the Hawaii Board of Education and Sub-Committees. State and complex area personnel also were invited and presented at the Southeast Comprehensive Center Forum. The State also submits reports to the State Legislature on Restructuring and provides information as requested to the media.

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:**

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 Department received the grant notification for Section 1003(g) on December 28, 2007. The Special Programs Management Section (SPMS) of the Hawaii Department of Education did not receive the Section 1003(g) funds until August 18, 2008. As a result, the project director was unable to implement the interventions of the Section 1003(g) funds in the 2007-2008 school year, and conduct an evaluation of the strategic interventions supported by the funds.

However, SPMS conducted meetings for principals in June of 2008 and July 2008 for all 15 complex areas on all islands in anticipation of the funds. The principals of charter and Department schools had an opportunity for one-to-one or small group technical assistance regarding the objectives of the funds and how to submit an application for the funds.

Principals were given copies of the application forms and if requested, an electronic version of the application forms. The principals and school level grant coordinators were provided technical assistance by the State on developing their application and providing training on such areas as how to conduct a needs assessment, how to develop a school-wide plan.

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.

No application for a child that was eligible for PSC or SES was denied by the Hawaii Department of Education. However, at the end of the school year, there were carryover funds for the state set-aside for PSC and SES. Hawaii DOE carryover procedure is that the carryover funds are utilized for the restructuring of NCLB Status Schools. In addition, state funds were also consolidated to support NCLB Status Schools.

These federal and state funds support comprehensive restructuring services by Professional Services Contractors, coaches that are embedded in the schools and Array of Services contracts from Professional Services Providers in one of the five categories: 1) School Leadership Development (Onsite Coaching and Mentoring, Organizational Structures, Resource Management, building Capacity to Orchestrate School Improvement and Reform, and School Environment and Safety); 2) Standards-based Education/Professional Development, 3) Assessment System, 4) Learning Environment, and 5) Family/Parent/Community Support.

In our fourth year of restructuring, our analysis of the school improvement and turnaround efforts of the schools have found the following indicators critical for school improvement:

School Turnaround must:

- Have a school plan aligned with a comprehensive needs assessment and the state strategic goals, standards, and benchmarks, and have school-wide agreements by all stakeholders on the vision, mission, and core values and principles of the school;
- Customize services to the school, based on comprehensive needs assessment;
- Embed services in the school and drilling down to the classroom level;
- Develop a comprehensive assessment system aligned to state standards and benchmarks
  - Aligned to curriculum maps;
  - Have the capacity to create formative assessments for the classroom teachers;
  - Include training and services to develop professional learning communities which focus on looking at student work, development of exemplars, creating rubrics and student-self assessment tools; and
  - Provide feedback on student performance on instructional expectations.
- Include professional development in building standards-based classrooms in which students are aware of what is quality products and performances;
- Provide guidance in developing Professional Learning Communities;
- Provide consultation to leadership on the systems of the school such as communication, organization, assessment, discipline, learning environment, etc.
- Include professional development on core subject content and instructional strategies, followed by coaching and mentoring of teachers and support instructional staff.
- Have a strong school leadership component to develop the school leadership team and to build the capacity of the school administrator to become truly a curriculum leader.
- Include coaching on building parent/community involvement
- Address any issue regarding school environment, if it a major concern of the school.
- Address organizational issues and scheduling, if it is a root cause of low student achievement
- Address the development of deficient or ineffective systems such as: decision-making; communication, organizational management, assessment, etc.

As a result, our comprehensive restructuring providers must address all five categories for school improvement and develop the indicators listed above.

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	78,143
Applied to transfer	4,332
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,674

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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0
<b>Comments: None.</b>	

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

### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
<b>Comments: None.</b>	

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

### FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school<sup>3</sup> that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

*b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

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

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	34,686
Applied for supplemental educational services	7,778
Received supplemental educational services	5,238
<b>Comments: 7,778 supplemental educational services applications were received. 5,238 parent/students completed the SES agreement of services process and received free tutoring services.</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,941,999
<b>Comments: Figures are accurate as reported.</b>	

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

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	27,595	19,391	70.3	8,204	29.7
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1,230	1,115	90.7	115	9.3
Low-poverty schools	1,410	1,323	93.8	87	6.2
All elementary schools	5,951	5,410	90.9	541	9.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	3,562	2,035	57.1	1,527	42.9
Low-poverty schools	7,041	4,812	68.3	2,229	31.7
All secondary schools	21,644	13,981	64.6	7,663	35.4
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Yes, elementary classes are counted as one class for full-day self-contained.

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

#### FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core*

academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	13.5
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	12.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	74.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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)	15.6
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	51.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Web page didn't automatically give the total of 100.00 as it did in the elementary part. System check gave this as an error but total of 15.6% + 51.5% + 32.9% is 100.0

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	29.0
Poverty metric used	Free, reduced and certified lunch count.	
Secondary schools	53.0	27.0
Poverty metric used	Free, reduced and certified lunch count.	
<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
No Response	Dual language	
No Response	Two-way immersion	
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Ilokano, Marshallese, Chuukese
No Response	Developmental bilingual	
No Response	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Part-time teachers conduct push-in intervention to provide language instructional support to students.

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	17,868
<b>Comments:</b> The above figure includes students who may have withdrawn during the school year and left the state or enrolled in private schools.	

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

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.6.2.2 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.	17,868
<b>Comments: All English Language Learners are considered for NCLB Title III purposes. There may be a discrepancy with the EDEN # (20,404) because the EDEN figure includes enrolled students who are considered potential ELLs and includes students who have withdrawn and left the school system. The figure of 17,868 students are all students at the end of the school year who were serviced and still enrolled in the ELL program.</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
Ilokano	4,546
Tagalog	1,780
Marshallese	1,767
Chuukese	1,708
Spanish	1,434

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

Samoan (1269); Chinese (1058); Japanese (1000); Vietnamese (607); Korean (592); Tongan (521); and another 65+ additional languages

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	16,836
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,032
Total	17,868
<b>Comments: Data set of 17,868 students excludes withdrawn students, students who left the system during the school year 2007-08, and is an end of school year count. Number of students not tested is due to truancy, travel, charter school enrollments, incompatible data systems, etc.</b>	

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

Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,751
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	
<b>Comments: System not allowing entry into "Percent Proficient" field. State response is: 1,751 students who exited academically, of 17,868 total students equals 9.8% of students.</b>	

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

Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	16,836
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,032
Total	17,868
<b>Comments: Data set excludes students who were not continually enrolled and/or withdrew from school system. Number of students not tested is due to truancy, travel, charter school enrollment and incompatible data systems, etc.</b>	

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

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

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	7,570	71.9
ELP attainment	1,751	9.8
<b>Comments: Denominator of "Making Progress," students which have two data points is 10,529. Denominator of "ELP Attainment," is based on total continuous enrollment end of year population of 17868.</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).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<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)
<b>Comments:</b>

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



### 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
844	1,243	2,087
<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
1,508	927		
<b>Comments: The figures above include students who may not have met the "Full Academic Year" criteria, and where the full set of AYP calculations have not been run.</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
1,509	1,148	76.1	
<b>Comments: 361 = # Below Proficient</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
671	279		
<b>Comments: There were less grades tested in science, i.e., grades 5, 7, 11. % Results above cannot be modified. 42% Results; 392 = # Below Proficient</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	1
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	1
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
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)	1
<b>Comments: The SEA/LEA has struggled to meet one or more AMAOs annually.</b>	

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

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

#### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
3,032	2,513	1

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.

Hawaii is a unitary system as both the LEA and SEA.

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.	146
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	42

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The estimate number of additional 42 teachers, approximately 8.4 teachers annually over the next 5 years. Calculation is based on historical growth from 2004 to 2008, and assumes sufficient ELL NCLB Title III staff is already available.

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

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

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

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

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	1	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	1	
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	1	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	1	696
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	1	524
PD provided to principals	1	72
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	1	64
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	1	641
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	487
Total	1	2,484

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because of Hawaii's status of SEA/LEA the professional development activities of the state and complex areas across the state were summarized and compiled here.

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
7/1/08	3/17/08	229
<b>Comments: 7/1/08 date is based on the grant award letter and notification. 3/17/08 from superintendent's grant award allocation notice.</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.

The state is continually looking to see how it can improve its funding allocation process. The application itself has been shortened, the application request for funds process has been initiated earlier, and training with regard to the request for funds is being provided. The state is also assuring that proper review of plans and feedback is in place and provided. In addition, clearer guidance with regard to specific allowable NCLB Title III funding, as was done this fall 2008, with regards to supplement/supplant, will help tremendously.

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	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	69.2
Hispanic	70.5
White, non-Hispanic	78.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	72.5
Limited English proficient	75.5
Economically disadvantaged	74.2
Migratory students	80.0
Male	76.4
Female	82.2
<b>Comments: Migratory students data checked and verified.</b>	

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

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6.4
Hispanic	7.0
White, non-Hispanic	5.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.8
Limited English proficient	10.6
Economically disadvantaged	6.3
Migratory students	5.4
Male	5.6
Female	4.7
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

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

### 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	1	1
Total	1	1
<b>Comments: The State of Hawaii is one SEA/LEA.</b>		

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

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

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

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	15
K	0	80
1	0	74
2	0	91
3	0	90
4	0	63
5	0	80
6	0	72
7	0	69
8	0	79
9	0	89
10	0	55
11	0	33
12	0	35
Ungraded	0	0
Total	0	925
<b>Comments: The State of Hawaii is one SEA/LEA.</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	0	594
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	0	81
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	0	250
Hotels/Motels	0	0
Total	0	925
<b>Comments: The State of Hawaii is one SEA/LEA.</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)	15
K	80
1	74
2	91
3	90
4	63
5	80
6	72
7	69
8	79
9	89
10	55
11	33
12	35
Ungraded	0
Total	925
<b>Comments: Data is accurate as reported.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	N<10
Migratory children/youth	79
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	169
Limited English proficient students	162
<b>Comments: Data is accurate as reported.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	1
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	1
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	1
Transportation	1
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	1
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	1
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	1
Coordination between schools and agencies	1
Counseling	1
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	1
Clothing to meet a school requirement	1
School supplies	1
Referral to other programs and services	1
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Hawaii is one SEA/LEA.

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	1
School Selection	1
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School Selection: Statewide training was provided to appropriate school and complex area personnel in the enhanced systemic strategies for school selection when enrolling McKinney-Vento eligible students.

Eligibility for Homeless Services: During SY 2007-2008, the State developed a protocol for identifying the families in "Doubled Up" situations.

Other Medical Records: Tuberculin Clearance is required for participation in Hawaii's school. However, the State's present process for expediting student participation includes assistance with access to free TB testing as well as a homework provision.

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	67	27
4	53	23
5	60	13
6	53	13
7	51	14
8	51	18
High School	26	13
<b>Comments: Data is accurate as reported.</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	67	18
4	53	11
5	60	N<10
6	53	11
7	49	N<10
8	51	N<10
High School	27	N<10
<b>Comments: Data is accurate as reported.</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)	87
K	110
1	95
2	97
3	80
4	81
5	67
6	77
7	59
8	36
9	114
10	93
11	60
12	63
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	24
Total	1,143
<b>Comments: Data reflects the reporting period of September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2008.</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 increase in numbers for Category 1 is due to several factors. Last year's numbers reflected many families who had settled out and the lack of MEP recruiters in the field. Last year's numbers were 586 eligible students. This year's increase was due in part to the intense emphasis we placed on our ID&R efforts. By being able to hire more recruiters for our school complexes, allowed us to reach out to more eligible families that we missed in the past. The other factor was the MEP staff being able to communicate with the community about the MEP program and eligibility requirements under NCLB.

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)	10
K	39
1	25
2	24
3	20
4	17
5	18
6	22
7	13
8	22
9	N<10
10	10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	238
<b>Comments: The summer count is reported by the sites. Data is collected from the state At Risk Worksheet that each site completes annually.</b>	

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

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A significant factor that all of our schools in our state experienced during the Summer 2008 and the years previous to this, is a shorter summer break. This is due to Hawaii's movement to a single school year calendar for all schools. The summer break was shortened to six weeks rather than the normal eight weeks. This did not leave much time for schools to run a summer program across the state. If a summer program was runned, it was more for enrichment purposes rather tan assisting with academics.

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.

Hawaii utilized appropriately coded historical data from the MIS2000 system to generate the 2007-2008 child count report. The MIS2000 Snap report for table C-7 was used to compile the Category 1 and Category 2 child count. MIS2000 was also used to check for duplicates by matching data elements and adjustments were made. Over-age students and those turning 3 years of age were similarly flagged via the system. All two year-olds turning 3 years of age during the count dates were moved up and included in the 3-21 year age range for count purposes. Category 2 counts were verified through documentation provided through enrollment lists, attendance rosters, etc. Periodic checks of status reports were conducted to determine accuracy of coded information. In addition, Hawaii's state-wide student information VAX system was used to verify enrollment, withdrawal, and demographic data. A special team of MEP hired personnel was trained in the identification and recruitment process in our state and they verified residency during the count period and documented new qualifying moves by completing a new COE. In addition, Hawaii required recruiters to contact migrant families annually, at minimum, and to record contact information/status in the appropriate section of the COE. All changes and new information is entered into the MIS2000 system throughout the year prior to generating the child count reports. A thorough manual review of child count lists is conducted by program staff prior to submittal to this report.

Hawaii utilized the MIS2000 system to manage the state's data and to generate its 2006-2007 child count report last year. MIS2000 was used to check for duplicates and a total count. Hence, the same system was used for both reporting periods.

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.

The data inputted in the MIS2000 database system reflects the information documented on the state approved Hawaii Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. The data collected included: Parent and Child Data (name, date of birth, gender, race, place of birth, parent's or guardian's names, physical and/or mailing address, student identification number); Eligibility Data (QAD, residency date, termination date, withdrawal date, qualifying activity, where the family moved to and from); School Information (enrollment date, withdrawal date, enrollment type (regular/summer), grade, name of facility); Other (worker's name, whether the child moved with, to join, or on his or her own, type of work, i.e. seasonal, temporary, or fishing related, interviewer's name, who the information was obtained from, assurance that parents were informed of the Family Rights and Privacy Act, interviewer's signature, reviewer's initials, date interview was conducted, SEA certification).

During the 2007-08 count period, MEP staff, recruiters, and special ID&R team made telephone or personal face-to-face contact with families to verify information, determine continued eligibility, and to validate new qualifying moves. All data on new qualifying moves was documented on state-approved COEs. In addition, recruiters, MEP staff, and ID&R team verified residency dates, enrollment/withdrawal dates for the school year, summer enrollment/withdrawal dates, and supplemental services provided to students. Recruiters, MEP staff, and ID&R team also contacted school clerks and registrars for status updates on previously qualified students and to obtain lists of newly-arrived potential eligibles for follow-up. Churches, farms, agricultural businesses, co-ops, farm labor contractors, university extension personnel, applicable state agencies, human resources leaders and community organizations were also contacted for referrals.

Hawaii recruiters meet with the MEP Director and ID&R Coordinator semiannually to review eligibility criteria and eligibility lists. Individual recruiters met with the ID&R coordinator on a monthly basis and in between meeting dates on a at needs basis. Data updated into th MIS2000 on a regular basis by the MEP secretary who manages the data base. Recruiters are provided with a list of all eligible students in the State to assist them in their recruitment efforts. All families with soon to expire QAD dates are contacted to determine if a new qualifying move has occurred. In addition, Hawaii added another field to the MIS2000 record system to include the name of the recruiter for each COE for quick and easy reference. This has significantly improved efficiency whenever questions have arisen that required recruiter verification or input.

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.

All information was recorded on the state COE form where recruiters also noted questions and explanation regarding eligibility in the comment section. Recruiters signed the COEs and the original and triplicate NCR copies were forwarded to the SEA. Upon receipt, the SEA reviewed the COE, verified information contained by comparing it to the State VAX system, and certified eligibility by signing them. The original white copy of the COE was retained by the SEA for their files and the triplicate NCR copies forwarded back to the recruiters for their files.

Throughout the year and before the end of the school year, recruiters made contact with their families and recorded status information in the appropriate section of the NCR copies of the COE, noting contact date, eligibility status and initialed them. They then forwarded the first NCR copy to the SEA with changes and status noted. This copy was added to the SEA original file. If a change in status required a new COE, this information was noted on the NCR copy and a new COE was completed and forwarded with it. The process was repeated each year throughout the three-year eligibility period until the original and three copies were on file at the SEA or until a new COE was generated for a new qualifying move.

The SEA secretary, who serves as the data records clerk, inputted all COE information and student participation in regular and summer term into the MIS2000 database system, enabling her to maintain the system and generate all necessary reports.

The resource teacher or records data clerk reviewed the COEs which were forwarded to the state director for final review and signature. This final signature certified eligibility. In the absence of the state director, the state Identification and Recruitment resource teacher has authority to certify student for eligibility.

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.

Hawaii developed an Excel spreadsheet with drop down menus that is forwarded electronically to all schools to report MEP-funded services students received during the regular school year and summer terms. These are returned to the SEA electronically where a master spreadsheet is maintained for use in preparing child count and the Consolidated State Performance Reports as well as a basis for data collection for input into the MIS2000 system.

### 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.

The MIS2000 is a unique database system with built-in features that assure that a child is counted only once. To comply with those features, a meticulous effort is made to code each child appropriately as per the COE information, verifying enrollment, withdrawal and other demographic data with our statewide student information VAX system data so that the system can generate accurate child count reports that meet the four (4) criteria mentioned above. The SEA migrant secretary is the only individual permitted to input data into the system ensuring that the data is inputted and coded accurately and consistently. Each student is coded in either the regular "R" or summer "S" enrollment type.

The SEA migrant secretary maintains direct communication with MIS2000 staff that created special reports assuring that only the students meeting the criteria for the child count reports are included.

A C7 12-Month List report generates lists of students between ages 3-21, who are within 3 years of their QAD, and who had a Residency, QAD, Withdraw date, Enroll date, or Term date during the date range requested of 9/1/2007 and 8/31/2008, and have a regular "R" enroll type.

A C7 Summer List report was also created that generates a list of students with the same criteria as the 12 month list but who were coded with summer "S" enroll type and who were coded with a supplement count vice provided to them (e.g., summer school, preschool, etc.)

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.

Hawaii developed an Excel spreadsheet with drop down menus that is forwarded electronically to all schools to report MEP-funded services students received during the regular school year and summer terms. These are returned to the SEA electronically where a master spreadsheet is maintained for use in preparing child count and consolidated performance reports as well as a basis for data collection for input into the MIS2000 system.

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.

Hawaii has a state COE approval process to ensure that only eligible children are entered into the MIS2000 database system. A standard COE is used statewide. The first quality control measure is to ensure that all recruiters participate in a comprehensive recruiter-training program. A recruiter must have at least 20 hours of training prior to being certified as a Hawaii migrant recruiter. Recruiters receive annual eight-hour review sessions before the start of the new school year to review basic eligibility criterion. The SEA also meets with recruiters semiannually to allow recruiters to review eligibility criteria to strengthen their recruitment skills, and to network and share new information and ideas.

The State COE approval process has several steps to ensure the eligibility of migrant children identified and included in the annual count:

1. The recruiter completes and signs a state approved COE form after a face-to-face or telephone interview including all the information requested on the form; as well as any additional comments that may assist in determining eligibility.
2. The recruiter submits the original and triplicate NCR COE signed forms to the SEA records clerk who checks that all the necessary information is present.
3. If there are questionable areas or additional information needed to determine eligibility, the records clerk returns the COE to the recruiter.
4. The recruiter obtains the necessary information and re-submits the COE form.
5. The records clerk verifies the demographic information through the state informational VAX system and then forwards the COE to the resource teacher and program director for final approval and signatures.
6. The records clerk enters the information in the MIS2000 database system.
7. Three signed copies of the COE are forwarded to the recruiter for his or her files.
8. The records clerk files the original copy of the COE in the SEA file.
9. The same process is followed as new qualifying move dates are entered.
10. The SEA Director is the final authority for resolving eligibility issues at the local and state level.

Hawaii also incorporated a checklist targeting key eligibility criteria that must be completed by the recruiter and attached to each new COE. Recruiters review and update checklist information whenever parent contact is made throughout the year. Copies of checklists are forwarded to the SEA and placed in the COE file after review and verification by the SEA.

Even though these quality control procedures have several checks and balances and involve several different people, the SEA provides a final check by selecting a random sample of COEs to verify information and documentation. Information received from the random sampling serves as a basis for future procedural revisions. A record of all quality improvement actions are maintained at the SEA. Identification and recruitment practices of individual recruiters are monitored regularly and all inputted information is reviewed on a regular basis. Whenever questions or discrepancies are noted, the SEA follows up by contacting families for verification.

For summer/intersession projects, the SEA reviews student attendance records and makes on-site visits to selected projects. The SEA also randomly selects a family for re-interview by telephone or personal visit for quality control.

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.

A reinterviewing process was not done during this reporting period. However, a recertification was done for those families whose COE recently expired or was going to expire by the end of the school year. A list of those families who met this criterion was generated from the MIS2000 system. A total of 931 students met this criteria and were reinterviewed. 744 students were found to be eligible and 187 students settled out.

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.

For accuracy of child count data, periodic status reports are generated from the MIS2000 system. SEA staff reviews the information to check for accuracy, verify QAD, and qualifying move dates by comparing the information with COE records on file. Additionally, SEA staff checks to determine if services students received were appropriately coded.

All necessary updates in family and student data were inputted into the MIS2000 system. The completed C7 Snap Report, incorporated by MIS2000, was used to generate the 2007-2008 child count reports for both the Category 1 and Category 2.

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.

SEA staff met with recruiters in late August to review child count information and provide them with status reports that included anniversary dates of all children assigned to their complexes. Recruiters, MEP Staff, and ID&R team contacted families for another personal interview to verify student and eligibility information. If the child was not in school, the recruiter/MEP Staff/ID&R team verified that the child was a resident and present in the State during the child count period. Updates were forwarded to the records clerk for system input. As a final check, the SEA does a thorough manual review of child count data prior to submittal of the child count report to OME to ensure that the data submitted is accurate.

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.

Based on the recertification process that was done during the 2006-2007 school year, a ID&R training plan was developed for the 2007-2008 school year. An integral piece of this plan was the hiring of more recruiters for those areas that had a high population of migrant families settling in that area. In addition to this, the need was to assign a recruiter to each complex of schools so that they became a contact point for our schools. Monthly meetings with the MEP staff at the school level has helped to facilitate an awareness of the ID&R process so that the school level personnel can assist the recruiters in identifying those families in need of migrant services. The implementation of this plan is evident by the increase in our migrant student count for the 2007-2008 school year.

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.

No concerns in the accuracy of the reported child count. The numbers reported are as accurate as stated.

The Category 2 data is preliminary as we are still awaiting some of the data from the summer school programs as all have not been turned in at the time of this report. Data will be updated in our CSPR Part II report. A significant factor that all of our schools in our state experienced during the Summer 2008 school year is a shorter summer break due to Hawaii's movement to a single school year calendar for all schools. The summer break was shortened to six weeks rather than the normal eight weeks. This did not leave much time for schools to run a summer program across the state. If a summer program was run it was more for enrichment purposes rather than assisting with academics.

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