

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

IOWA



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).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

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

Address:
400 East 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319.0146

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Del Hoover

Telephone: 515-281-8402

Fax: 515-281-7700

e-mail: del.hoover@iowa.gov

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

Wednesday, March 11, 2009, 6:28:02 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.

"No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The state's assessments and academic achievement standards in science are 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	244,103	242,586	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,406	1,390	98.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,090	5,059	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	13,768	13,573	98.6
Hispanic	15,754	15,628	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	208,085	206,936	99.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,133	33,910	99.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,703	9,627	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	82,368	81,683	99.2
Migratory students	1,185	1,184	99.9
Male	125,051	124,284	99.4
Female	118,892	118,286	99.5
Comments:			

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	5,826	17.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,619	78.5
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	1,465	4.3
Total	33,910	

Comments: aa

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	244,224	242,984	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,407	1,395	99.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,089	5,037	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	13,776	13,647	99.1
Hispanic	15,749	15,615	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	208,203	207,290	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,133	34,028	99.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,710	9,565	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	82,434	81,874	99.3
Migratory students	1,186	1,175	99.1
Male	125,090	124,455	99.5
Female	118,966	118,511	99.6
Comments:			

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	5,839	17.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,714	78.5
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	1,475	4.3
Total	34,028	
Comments: dxd		

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	106,196	104,723	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	607	586	96.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,136	2,096	98.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,662	5,500	97.1
Hispanic	6,210	6,055	97.5
White, non-Hispanic	91,581	90,483	98.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,145	14,332	94.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,482	3,379	97.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,008	32,313	97.9
Migratory students	470	451	96.0
Male	54,291	53,466	98.5
Female	51,826	51,257	98.9
Comments: Numbers represent grades 5, 8, and 11			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
Comments: Science is not reported for AYP decisions, so no data collected for assessment type.		

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

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
All students	34,312	25,749	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	116	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	768	586	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,126	1,060	49.9
Hispanic	2,558	1,436	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,663	22,551	78.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,241	1,915	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,858	935	50.3
Economically disadvantaged students	12,871	8,025	62.3
Migratory students	180	93	51.7
Male	17,615	13,353	75.8
Female	16,697	12,396	74.2
Comments:			

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

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
All students	34,396	25,640	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	127	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	762	579	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2,146	1,143	53.3
Hispanic	2,553	1,406	55.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,738	22,385	77.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,248	1,547	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,841	851	46.2
Economically disadvantaged students	12,903	7,910	61.3
Migratory students	177	90	50.8
Male	17,645	12,593	71.4
Female	16,751	13,047	77.9
Comments:			

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
Grade 3			
All students	31,937	25,022	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	125	66.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	705	554	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2,060	1,110	53.9
Hispanic	2,359	1,489	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	26,626	21,744	81.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,732	2,181	58.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,734	1,008	58.1
Economically disadvantaged students	11,973	8,056	67.3
Migratory students	149	101	67.8
Male	16,357	12,790	78.2
Female	15,580	12,232	78.5
Comments:			

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
Grade 4			
All students	34,181	27,032	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	120	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	756	637	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,108	1,115	52.9
Hispanic	2,456	1,533	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,675	23,627	82.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,742	2,306	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,747	977	55.9
Economically disadvantaged students	12,665	8,444	66.7
Migratory students	173	98	56.6
Male	17,433	13,952	80.0
Female	16,748	13,080	78.1
Comments:			

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
Grade 4			
All students	34,247	26,277	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	117	63.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	752	581	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,112	1,145	54.2
Hispanic	2,451	1,460	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,747	22,974	79.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,750	1,853	39.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,735	845	48.7
Economically disadvantaged students	12,694	8,106	63.9
Migratory students	172	90	52.3
Male	17,466	13,015	74.5
Female	16,781	13,262	79.0
Comments:			

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
Grade 4			
All students	32,986	27,545	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	128	72.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	728	595	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,045	1,246	60.9
Hispanic	2,293	1,585	69.1
White, non-Hispanic	27,743	23,991	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,385	2,818	64.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,631	1,010	61.9
Economically disadvantaged students	12,086	8,819	73.0
Migratory students	160	105	65.6
Male	16,808	14,003	83.3
Female	16,178	13,542	83.7
Comments:			

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
Grade 5			
All students	34,134	27,113	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	130	62.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	775	668	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	2,179	1,227	56.3
Hispanic	2,408	1,568	65.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,564	23,520	82.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,029	2,327	46.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,697	998	58.8
Economically disadvantaged students	12,332	8,246	66.9
Migratory students	184	105	57.1
Male	17,495	14,078	80.5
Female	16,639	13,035	78.3
Comments:			

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
Grade 5			
All students	34,180	26,095	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	142	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	771	615	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2,190	1,213	55.4
Hispanic	2,405	1,405	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,604	22,720	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,052	1,921	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,686	796	47.2
Economically disadvantaged students	12,355	7,808	63.2
Migratory students	183	93	50.8
Male	17,515	13,115	74.9
Female	16,665	12,980	77.9
Comments:			

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
Grade 5			
All students	34,142	28,003	82.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	144	68.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	770	638	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2,182	1,305	59.8
Hispanic	2,388	1,599	67.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,593	24,317	85.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,037	2,900	57.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,676	974	58.1
Economically disadvantaged students	12,331	8,691	70.5
Migratory students	179	118	65.9
Male	17,495	14,384	82.2
Female	16,647	13,619	81.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,209	26,096	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	122	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	719	597	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,886	921	48.8
Hispanic	2,262	1,330	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,128	23,126	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,978	1,823	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,325	647	48.8
Economically disadvantaged students	11,958	7,378	61.7
Migratory students	178	86	48.3
Male	17,646	13,462	76.3
Female	16,563	12,634	76.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,227	23,378	68.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	215	117	54.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	714	530	74.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,894	801	42.3
Hispanic	2,254	1,114	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	29,150	20,816	71.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,987	1,312	26.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,310	471	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	11,976	6,363	53.1
Migratory students	177	73	41.2
Male	17,654	11,665	66.1
Female	16,573	11,713	70.7
Comments:			

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
Grade 6			
All students	34,015	27,070	79.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	141	65.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	710	582	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,872	973	52.0
Hispanic	2,246	1,353	60.2
White, non-Hispanic	28,973	24,021	82.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,803	2,358	49.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,301	615	47.3
Economically disadvantaged students	11,856	7,835	66.1
Migratory students	174	88	50.6
Male	17,525	13,884	79.2
Female	16,490	13,186	80.0
Comments:			

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
Grade 7			
All students	34,680	26,287	75.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	122	61.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	703	578	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,911	908	47.5
Hispanic	2,216	1,231	55.6
White, non-Hispanic	29,651	23,448	79.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,043	1,662	33.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,260	547	43.4
Economically disadvantaged students	11,646	6,952	59.7
Migratory students	185	83	44.9
Male	17,805	13,496	75.8
Female	16,875	12,791	75.8
Comments:			

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
Grade 7			
All students	34,748	24,200	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	108	53.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	702	519	73.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,916	836	43.6
Hispanic	2,218	1,069	48.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,710	21,668	72.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,044	1,243	24.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,259	415	33.0
Economically disadvantaged students	11,673	6,054	51.9
Migratory students	185	77	41.6
Male	17,840	11,896	66.7
Female	16,908	12,304	72.8
Comments:			

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
Grade 7			
All students	34,516	27,581	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	140	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	700	568	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,896	1,036	54.6
Hispanic	2,190	1,281	58.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,531	24,556	83.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,837	2,383	49.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,242	559	45.0
Economically disadvantaged students	11,547	7,672	66.4
Migratory students	183	88	48.1
Male	17,704	13,976	78.9
Female	16,812	13,605	80.9
Comments:			

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
Grade 8			
All students	35,508	26,461	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	116	57.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	695	555	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,898	819	43.2
Hispanic	2,116	1,106	52.3
White, non-Hispanic	30,597	23,865	78.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,212	1,579	30.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,045	436	41.7
Economically disadvantaged students	11,425	6,608	57.8
Migratory students	160	71	44.4
Male	18,247	13,592	74.5
Female	17,261	12,869	74.6
Comments:			

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
Grade 8			
All students	35,593	25,083	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	124	61.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	693	489	70.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,915	808	42.2
Hispanic	2,124	979	46.1
White, non-Hispanic	30,659	22,683	74.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,264	1,324	25.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,041	311	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	11,482	6,094	53.1
Migratory students	158	60	38.0
Male	18,289	12,591	68.8
Female	17,304	12,492	72.2
Comments:			

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
Grade 8			
All students	35,551	28,147	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	132	65.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	691	555	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,913	1,050	54.9
Hispanic	2,107	1,241	58.9
White, non-Hispanic	30,637	25,169	82.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,264	2,370	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,029	460	44.7
Economically disadvantaged students	11,442	7,497	65.5
Migratory students	154	83	53.9
Male	18,275	14,228	77.9
Female	17,562	13,919	79.3
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	35,801	27,506	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	108	58.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	646	493	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,467	626	42.7
Hispanic	1,614	877	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	31,889	25,402	79.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,665	1,494	32.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	695	264	38.0
Economically disadvantaged students	8,928	5,314	59.5
Migratory students	124	60	48.4
Male	18,160	13,978	77.0
Female	17,641	13,528	76.7
Comments:			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	35,836	27,396	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	112	60.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	646	497	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,477	747	50.6
Hispanic	1,614	893	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	31,914	25,147	78.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,674	1,514	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	693	225	32.5
Economically disadvantaged students	8,937	5,361	60.0
Migratory students	123	55	44.7
Male	18,170	13,303	73.2
Female	17,666	14,093	79.8
Comments:			

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
High School			
All students	35,635	28,472	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	110	60.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	645	515	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,455	760	52.2
Hispanic	1,595	964	60.4
White, non-Hispanic	31,757	26,123	82.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,627	1,890	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	687	295	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	8,849	5,824	65.8
Migratory students	119	58	48.7
Male	18,073	13,949	77.2
Female	17,562	14,523	82.7
Comments:			

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	1,477	1,025	69.4
Districts	364	329	90.4
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	654	490	74.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	142	59	41.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	512	431	84.2
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
364	351	96.4
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	1
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
Comments:	

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

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.

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 Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts in Need of Assistance (Improvement) have access to the Iowa Statewide Support Team. In years one and two of identification, districts file an amendment to their Comprehensive School Improvement Plan that is required by Chapter 12 of the Iowa Administrative Code. These amendments focus on changes in district professional, district efforts to improve/increase parent involvement, and improvements in instructional programming to better meet all students needs. Districts that have reached year three of greater work with the State Support team and go through an audit and diagnosis process, action plans are then developed to address the areas of need revealed by the gap analysis. Districts then implement the action plans and monitor the effectiveness of the strategies.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	3
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	12	8
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	08/21/07
---	----------

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	3,532	3,513
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	1,859	1,782
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	52.6	50.7
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	1,654	1,705
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	46.8	48.5
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	12	
Comments: Includes only grades 3-8, and 11		

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	1
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	9
Comments:	

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
<p>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.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
<p>6 = Combo 1</p>	<p>All Schools were provide or used Iowa State Support team members to provide them training in Fierce Conversations. IOwa support Team members collaboratively worked with LEA and school staff in examining instructional strategies that were likely to improve teaching and learning in the classrooms. LEA and school staff utilized curriculum audits conducted by outside experts to improve their delivery of services to students. Partnerships were formed with parents and the Iowa Parents Resource Center</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Parents, teachers, students, and administration have pulled together to monitor student progress and move together to improve student achievement</p>
<p>Comments:</p>						

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.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

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.

identified school, district, Area Education Agency and Iowa School Support Team staff received many training/learning opportunities throughout the year. These included data retreats, cultural competency training, training from the Iowa Parents Information and Resource Center (on best practices on effective parent involvement), and training on conducting Fierce Conversations related to coaching. These strategies were then shared with colleagues in the identified districts and with other AEA staff. Research was distributed throughout the different agencies. In addition, many of the strategies were adopted and used by AEA's across the state as they work with districts and schools on school improvement. The knowledge gained by all were applied and incorporated into school and district improvement plans. Presentations were conducted at AEA and State level meetings and conferences.

I

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 IDE continues to monitor the effectiveness of the the Section 1003(g) funds by working with the State Support Team who provide on-going support to identified Title I schools. Building and District level action plans undergo a thorough review process beofre receiving State approval and funding. Action plans are monitored and revised as necessary throughout the year. Achievement results are monitored to note student gain within all required subgroups. All identified LEAs and buildings are visited by the IDE to ensure that pains and required actions are being completed.

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.

None

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	6,062
Applied to transfer	20
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	20

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments:	

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
Comments: No Title I funds were expended for choice option. LEAs used busing options already in place.	

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	3
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school³ 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.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	3,124
Applied for supplemental educational services	114
Received supplemental educational services	114
Comments:	

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	\$ 7,365
Comments:	

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	43,406	43,169	99.5	237	0.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	8,382	8,382	100.0	0	0.0
Low-poverty schools	6,804	6,744	99.1	60	0.9
All elementary schools	31,215	31,054	99.5	161	0.5
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	3,130	3,120	99.7	10	0.3
Low-poverty schools	2,892	2,875	99.4	17	0.6
All secondary schools	12,191	12,115	99.4	76	0.6
Comments: The Iowa Department of Education began collecting secondary data as those from grades 9-12 and elementary data as those from grades K-8 in 2007-08. Prior to that time, elementary data were collected for grades K-6 and secondary data were collected from grades 7-12. The 2007-08 data reported here are for elementary (grades K-8) and secondary (grades 9-12). That is the reason for the inconsistencies.					

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.

Iowa counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Iowa Department of Education has developed a system whereby schools enter data regarding teachers' assignment that is linked with each teacher's licensure information. In the event a teacher is assigned to an area for which he or she is not highly qualified, the system is alerted. Also, at any point during the school year, a district may hire a teacher who is not highly qualified. In either situation, the Department works with the district to ensure correction, including taking steps to force the district to remove the teacher or reassign the teacher to an area for which he/she is highly qualified.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Iowa Department of Education has developed a system whereby schools enter data regarding teachers' assignment that is linked with each teacher's licensure information. In the event a teacher is assigned to an area for which he or she is not highly qualified, the system is alerted. Also, at any point during the school year, a district may hire a teacher who is not highly qualified. In either situation, the Department works with the district to ensure correction, including taking steps to force the district to remove the teacher or reassign the teacher to an area for which he/she is highly qualified. Because of these reasons, 99.5 was rounded to 100%.

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	26.9	21.8
Poverty metric used	High/low poverty is based upon the top and bottom 25% of schools in terms of percent of their students that are eligible for free/reduced price lunch.	
Secondary schools	25.7	23.7
Poverty metric used	High/low poverty is based upon the top and bottom 25% of schools in terms of percent of their students that are eligible for free/reduced price lunch.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
No Response	Transitional bilingual	
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.

"Other"--LEAs use a combination of programs to provide services. Iowa's plan is based on consortia therefore all students are in a program or receive services (services are defined as modified instruction tutoring, before and afterschool programs, summer schools, etc; all of those activities not part of a "formal" program.)

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	19,736
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	19,736
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	13,531
Vietnamese	744
Bosnian	719
Lao	418
Undetermined	382

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

Arabic 269 students

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	18,861
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	875
Total	19,736
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	4,658
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	23.6
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	18,861
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	875
Total	19,736
Comments:	

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.

1.6.3.2.2 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	6,110	39.7
ELP attainment	3,585	23.3

Comments: • **Criteria for progress:** For AMAO 1, student-level progress, using a matched-score analysis, will be defined as an increase of one or more proficiency levels annually as follows: o Level 1 to Level 2 (or more) o Level 2 to Level 3 (or more) o Level 3 to Level 4 (or more) o Level 4 to Level 5 (or more) o Level 5 to Level 6 o For students at Level 6 and not yet exited from ELL services, a Level 6 must be maintained from one year to the next until the local education agency's (LEA) criteria for exiting services has been met. **Criteria for English language proficiency:** For AMAO 2, English language proficiency is at Level 6. • Level 6 requires a minimum overall score of 18 and is a maximum of 20. Level 6 is at least two of the subskills at Level 5 and the other two remaining subskills at a minimum of Level 4 or 5. All levels must be above a Level 3.

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
Comments:	

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)
Comments:

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
324	456	780
Comments:		

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
779	556	71.4	223
Comments:			

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
779	508	65.2	271
Comments:			

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
780	548	70.3	232
Comments:			

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	12
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	6
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	10
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	11
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	8
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	3
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	2
Comments:	

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>
Comments: Iowa met AMAO 1 in 10 of 12 AEA's, AMAO 2 in 11 of 12 AEA's. AMAOs 1 and 2 are met in 9 of 12 AEA's. AMAO 3 is met in 8 of 12 AEA's. However, the largest district Des Moines did not make AMAOs radically affecting the overall statewide results.	

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.	
Comments:	

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
4,122	2,364	5

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.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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.	332
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	450

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.

Although there is variation in the countries of origin, in the regions settled, languages spoken, the immigrant population is expect to grow in Iowa at about a pace of 5% per year. As that population grows, home languages other than English will become more common even for native-born students.

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	12	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	12	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	12	
Other (Explain in comment box)	12	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	12	3,618
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	12	874
PD provided to principals	12	253
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	12	192
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	12	872
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	830
Total	12	6,639

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	07/01/07	0
Comments: The AEAs have immediate access to Title III funds in that we have a reimbursement policy. The AEAs can apply for reimbursement for expensed incurred at any time. On July 1, 2007 some AEA were already drawing on funds for staff salaries, etc.		

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.

None

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
Comments:	

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	90.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	75.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic	74.6
Hispanic	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	92.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	87.8
Limited English proficient	72.8
Economically disadvantaged	82.3
Migratory students	0.0
Male	89.3
Female	91.8
Comments: Migrant categories won't be available until the 2007-2008 class.	

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	1.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3.7
Hispanic	3.5
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0.0
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	1.8
Female	1.4
Comments: Children with disabilities, LEP,migrant, and ecenomically disadvantaged will be avaiable next year	

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	352	352
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	362	362
Comments:		

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)	89	94
K	224	284
1	211	328
2	227	346
3	222	321
4	207	316
5	177	282
6	177	225
7	158	211
8	176	183
9	147	174
10	179	129
11	200	124
12	344	163
Ungraded	0	0
Total	2,738	3,180
Comments:		

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	925	988
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,568	2,085
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	18	23
Hotels/Motels	130	84
Total	2,641	3,180
Comments: Iowa allows districts to report a Primary Nighttime residence of Other and Unknown. We did go back to districts in an attempt to clarify the actual nighttime residences of homeless students. Although we were able to reclassify some students, there are still 97 students whose primary nighttime residence is still unknown. We have directed our state data collection staff not to include "other" and "unknown" as categories in collecting homeless residence data.		

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)	46
K	142
1	183
2	190
3	166
4	185
5	158
6	117
7	88
8	97
9	69
10	58
11	61
12	90
Ungraded	0
Total	1,650
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	104
Migratory children/youth	50
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	356
Limited English proficient students	168
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	9
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	5
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	5
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	4
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	3
School Selection	1
Transportation	4
School records	3
Immunizations	4
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	164	68
4	175	100
5	149	76
6	105	43
7	85	32
8	88	29
High School	47	23
Comments:		

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	165	81
4	174	101
5	149	79
6	105	52
7	82	33
8	88	28
High School	46	20
Comments:		

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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	302
K	216
1	234
2	210
3	223
4	166
5	178
6	145
7	152
8	111
9	145
10	99
11	123
12	77
Ungraded	48
Out-of-school	86
Total	2,515
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 child count for 2007-08 is slightly less than for 2006-07. It is not a significant decrease.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	30
1	39
2	29
3	32
4	34
5	23
6	23
7	26
8	14
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	264
Comments:	

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.

This count was inadvertently not collected during 2006-07 so we have no comparison between last count period and this one. We have reviewed the count for 2006-07 and find that there were 312 eligible migrant students enrolled in district summer sessions. Iowa's migrant student enrollment has been consistently decreasing over the past 3-4 years in both category 1 and 2 counts. Although the summer data was not collected for 2006-07, we can make the assumption that the count for that year was less than that of 2005-06 and more than the count for 2007-08. We anticipate continued decreases for 2008-09.

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.

Iowa used MS/EdD -MIS2000 to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period, 2007-08. The 2006-07 Category 1 and Category 2 child counts were generated with the same system.

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.

Child count data is gathered through informal surveys and interviews during school registration periods. Since all of Iowa's MEPs are school-based, it works best for families if we do the interviews at the school buildings. Frequently, local recruiters also go to local agribusinesses to gather data or do interviews. After completing the informal surveys and determining potential eligibility, local recruiters interview families to complete the COE.

The following data points are included on Iowa's COE:

Student Name/gender, race, birthdate/birthplace Parent/guardian name(s) Previous/current address(es) QAD/enrollment date(s) Worker's name/employment status School/district enrollment type/MEP project type/grade level ID#s -MSIX, State Immunization status/medical alert Indicators -Priority for services, IEP, LEP

We collect data and complete COEs throughout the year. However, we review and report only the data collected for the reporting period 09/01/2007-08/31/2008.

The same procedures are followed for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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 Iowa COEs are completed and reviewed at the local district level. Local interviewers sign off and date the COEs which are then sent to the State MEP Director for review and approval. Any COEs with missing, inaccurate or unclear information are sent back to the district for clarification/correction. The State MEP Director signs off and dates approved COEs. A letter is sent to the local district regarding each student's eligibility for the MEP. Information includes the student's name, eligibility status, birthdate and grade level. In 2009, the letter will also include the student's eligibility expiration date as a means of further verifying student eligibility.

Approved COEs are sent to the data entry staff person to be inputted into the MIS 2000 database. Data entry staff signs off and dates each COE after entry into MIS 2000. Copies are made of approved/entered COE and filed in the State MEP Director's office. The original COEs are sent back to the districts.

During the count period, we generate two reports: the first report identifies all eligible migrant students enrolled during the 09/01/2007-08/31/2008 time frame and the second report lists students previously enrolled students who still have eligibility. These reports are sent to each MEP where they are reviewed and corrected as needed. All changes and corrections are made at the state level in the MIS 2000 database and the count is generated from a review of the state and MIS 2000 databases.

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.

NA

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data from approved COEs are entered into the MIS 2000 database. The system has error checks that prevent incorrect/incomplete information from being entered. For example, if cells on the COE are not completed, the system will not allow the data entry to be continued and the student will not be counted. All required cells (eligibility criteria) must be complete for the data to be entered.

We generate two reports to verify eligible students: the first is used to identify eligible students enrolled for the first time during the 2007-08 reporting period and the second is used to identify students who were previously enrolled and whose eligibility has not expired. Districts review each report to verify: that there are no duplicates (ie: a student entered twice with name spelled differently or with two birthdates; that students are still in the district; that students have moved to a different school or grade within the district. Students no longer in the district during the count period are withdrawn from the database; corrections are made to demographic data such as name spellings and birthdates, etc. Duplicates are resolved and incorrect entries are deleted from the system.

All data is cross checked with data collected and compiled by the state data collection system. Discrepancies are resolved by reviewing existing data, reviewing COEs, and contacting local districts. All required changes are made to both the State and the MIS 2000 databases. Local district staff receive yearly training on eligibility criteria and accurate completion of the COE. Both the State MEP Director and the State Recruiter are available to provide additional training at any time

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.

NA

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.

Prior to the determination of the counts, two reports are sent to each MEP to verify that students listed on the reports were in the district during the count period. Copies of approved COEs are kept at the State MEP Director's office and can be reviewed to verify the eligibility of students on each report listing. Districts review each report to identify any discrepancies between their records and the MIS 2000 data. Occasionally, a district will have students on their local rolls who have not been entered into either the state or the MIS 2000 databases. Most often, the district had neglected to send in a completed COE, so the student was not entered into the database. This can be corrected with the approval of a completed COE.

Districts make changes on the verification report generated from the MIS 2000 database. Student changes such as expiration of eligibility, moving from the district, changing grade levels, and changing schools within the district are noted on the verification report which is sent back to the State MEP Director. Data entry staff make the necessary changes in the MIS 2000 database based on district changes. Ineligible students and those moving from the district are withdrawn from the database and no longer counted.

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.

Iowa has not implemented a formal re-interviewing process to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. Local districts are encouraged to do a random sampling of approved COEs during the school year in order to verify that information collected is accurate. Unfortunately, this practice is not consistently applied. At this time, the design and implementation of a formal re-interview process is still in discussion. Iowa is awaiting final guidelines from the Office of Migrant Education regarding the design of the re-interviewing activities.

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.

Upon approval by the State Migrant Education Director, all COEs are given to the data entry staff to be inputted in MIS2000. Error checks built into the MIS2000 system prevent the data entry staff person from entering incorrect/incomplete information. When errors are flagged, the LEA submitting the COE is contacted for clarification or correction of the data. All corrected COEs must be reviewed for accuracy and eligibility before being returned to the data entry staff person. If data cannot be clarified or corrected, the COE is not entered into MIS2000.

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.

Data collected in MIS2000 is cross-checked with our state databases to ensure that numbers match. In the event of mismatches, extensive review is done of all migrant databases to identify where errors have been made. Only when errors are corrected does the count information get certified as final. When numbers do not agree, we take the lower number.

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.

Iowa is awaiting final guidelines from the Office of Migrant Education regarding the design of the re-interviewing activities. The primary focus of our activities will be staff training on eligibility criteria and interviewing technique. The State MEP Director and the State Recruiter will conduct district trainings based on the process developed by the Office of Migrant Education. We will be available to assist districts as they implement their local re-interviewing processes for the first two years of the proposed 3-year re-interviewing cycle. For the third year, we will contract with an independent agency to design and conduct a formal re-interviewing process.

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.

Iowa's primary concern with accuracy is that multiple staff at the district level prepare and report data at different times for different data collection systems. Lack of communication between the staff creates significant differences in numbers between the separate databases. This results in additional time and effort on the part of the State MEP Director and state database staff to resolve. Generally, we've been able to clear up discrepancies through careful review of the databases and communication with districts. If we cannot come to satisfactory agreement on numbers, we always take the lower count.

We have been involved in a collaborative team effort to resolve the main issue of lack of communication between too many staff entering data at different times. We are revising sections of the state data collection system that will include migrant eligibility criteria and that will be entered only by one person at the district level. This will require district staff to work together to review data and prepare accurate reports prior to inputting into the state database. Cross checking between MIS 2000 and the state databases should be more efficient with fewer errors. Consistent training of and follow-up with district is a key component of this improved process.

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