

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

IDAHO



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008

PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

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:
Idaho State Board of Education

Address:
650 W. State St.
Boise, ID 83720-0037

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Tracie Bent

Telephone: 208-332-1582

Fax: 208-334-2632

e-mail: Tracie.Bent@osbe.idaho.gov

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

Friday, March 13, 2009, 1:01:24 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.

Mathematics Idaho is in the process of expanding our high school math standards for the year. The initial work began in August of 2007. The work was finalized in August of 2008 and sent to the State Board of Education for their approval. We are awaiting formal legislative action this January. We expect to have our new "course specific" standards implemented in the fall of 2009. The course specific are in addition to our grade-level content standards and designed to support classroom instruction as new and more rigorous high school graduation requirements take effect. At this time we are developing an alignment document to our "grade specific" standards and the 10th grade ISAT to assure a smooth transition this fall.

No work has been done on the K-8 standards. A revision process is set to begin the summer of 2009 with an implementation date of August 2011. This is not set in stone, just a tentative timeline in looking forward.

Science New Idaho Science Content Standards were developed in 2005 and implemented in 2006. these science standards include grade specific K-8, 8-9 Physical Science, 8-9 Earth Science, and 9-10 Biology. 11-12 Chemistry Standards were developed in June 2008. Chemistry is under Board approval currently to be submitted for Legislative vote for acceptance in the session starting January 2009. Physics and Environmental Science are slated to be developed in the near future. In 2010 Science Standards will be reviewed for the 2011 Science Text Book Adoption.

English Language Arts and Reading The English Language Arts Content Standards Part I and II will be reviewed and revised during the 2010-2011 school year. The revised standards will go before the SBOE in August of 2011. The standards will be adopted by the State legislature in 2012.

Part I of the English Language Arts Standards covers Reading (traditional k-12, researched based k-12, and researched based intervention reading).

Part II of the English Arts Standards covers English, spelling, composition, grammar, usage, and handwriting. It also includes communication categories speech, journalism, and reference books (dictionaries and thesaurus).

At this time, no major plans for major revisions of the English Language Arts Content Standards are anticipated.

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.

The State will continue to use the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) for grades 3-8 and 10, in math reading, language usage and grades 5,7, and 10 in science. Since the Peer review and full approval in November 2006, Idaho has had 2 administrations of the ISAT.

Idaho is currently revising the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IAA). The first operational test will be administered in the spring of 2009. Idaho is working closely with the United States Department of Education through the Peer Review Process to complete development of the revised IAA for grades 3-8 and 10, in math reading, language usage and grades 5,7, and 10 in science. The IAA is also used in grades 4,6, and 8 as an alternate to the Idaho Direct Math Assessment; in grades 5,7,9 for an alternate to the Idaho Direct Writing Assessment; grades K-2 for Idaho Reading Indicator. Following the first administration spring 09, and the necessary test development, validity, alignment, and standard setting, Idaho will submit the assessment for full approval in the fall of 2009.

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.

Idaho administered the ISAT Science in grades 5,7, and 10 in Spring 2007 and Spring 2008. Idaho Standard Achievement Test for Science is in Peer Review. Idaho has not received final notice of approval from Assistant Secretary Briggs.

The Idaho Alternate Assessment (IAA) is also in the process of Peer Review. Unlike the ISAT which was already developed, aligned to current Idaho Content Standards, and being successfully administered, the IAA had early approval when it was aligned to previous Idaho Content Standards. The IAA is going through Peer Review of Science and Idaho is taking the opportunity to bring the entire IAA into alignment with current Idaho Content Standards for Math, Reading, and Language Usage. The revised IAA will be ready for Spring 2009 administration.

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	143,758	142,974	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,331	2,314	99.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,383	2,373	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,710	1,696	99.2
Hispanic	20,130	19,990	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	116,606	116,017	99.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,556	13,395	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,261	8,211	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	58,433	58,137	99.5
Migratory students	1,575	1,558	98.9
Male	73,995	73,548	99.4
Female	69,763	69,426	99.5
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,600	34.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,650	57.1
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	1,145	8.5
Total	13,395	

Comments:

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	143,758	142,679	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,331	2,309	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,383	2,317	97.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,710	1,626	95.1
Hispanic	20,130	19,830	98.5
White, non-Hispanic	116,606	116,014	99.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,556	13,417	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,261	7,884	95.4
Economically disadvantaged students	58,433	57,912	99.1
Migratory students	1,575	1,522	96.6
Male	73,995	73,383	99.2
Female	69,763	69,296	99.3
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	12,225	91.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	38	0.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,154	8.6
Total	13,417	
Comments:		

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	60,683	59,843	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	965	940	97.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	998	965	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic	712	680	95.5
Hispanic	8,271	8,101	97.9
White, non-Hispanic	49,493	48,925	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,546	5,388	97.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,283	3,132	95.4
Economically disadvantaged students	23,143	22,791	98.5
Migratory students	622	605	97.3
Male	31,161	30,700	98.5
Female	29,522	29,143	98.7
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.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,930	35.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,068	56.9
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	390	7.2
Total	5,388	
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.

1.3 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	21,203	18,538	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	354	269	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	361	331	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	241	181	75.1
Hispanic	3,087	2,323	75.3
White, non-Hispanic	17,060	15,347	90.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,056	1,235	60.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,414	853	60.3
Economically disadvantaged students	9,501	7,709	81.1
Migratory students	252	181	71.8
Male	10,803	9,375	86.8
Female	10,400	9,163	88.1

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP.

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	21,156	17,506	82.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	354	248	70.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	307	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	229	167	72.9
Hispanic	3,061	2,046	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	17,058	14,651	85.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,057	1,029	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,354	653	48.2
Economically disadvantaged students	9,470	7,083	74.8
Migratory students	246	134	54.5
Male	10,777	8,552	79.4
Female	10,379	8,954	86.3

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP.

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Idaho assesses science in grades 5,7 and 10.			

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 C SPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 C SPR. 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	20,616	17,350	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	329	212	64.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	333	293	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	278	192	69.1
Hispanic	3,119	2,233	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,459	14,336	87.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,104	1,111	52.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,352	749	55.4
Economically disadvantaged students	9,360	7,220	77.1
Migratory students	273	180	65.9
Male	10,682	8,949	83.8
Female	9,934	8,401	84.6
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.

1.3.2.2 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	20,564	16,971	82.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	330	198	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	324	279	86.1
Black, non-Hispanic	265	193	72.8
Hispanic	3,091	1,989	64.3
White, non-Hispanic	16,457	14,230	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,109	1,010	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,279	550	43.0
Economically disadvantaged students	9,319	6,933	74.4
Migratory students	268	143	53.4
Male	10,653	8,583	80.6
Female	9,911	8,388	84.6
Comments: Idaho has a very low number of students in the Black, non-Hispanic population. Small changes reflect inordinate changes in percentages. The data is correct.			

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Idaho assesses science in grades 5,7 and 10.			

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

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
All students	20,263	15,830	78.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	332	192	57.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	325	276	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	249	154	61.8
Hispanic	2,949	1,782	60.4
White, non-Hispanic	16,304	13,348	81.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,034	796	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,234	516	41.8
Economically disadvantaged students	8,870	6,118	69.0
Migratory students	237	126	53.2
Male	10,444	8,237	78.9
Female	9,819	7,593	77.3

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP.

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

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
All students	20,213	17,047	84.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	331	229	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	319	284	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	243	179	73.7
Hispanic	2,918	2,041	70.0
White, non-Hispanic	16,298	14,227	87.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,036	996	48.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,174	581	49.5
Economically disadvantaged students	8,829	6,811	77.1
Migratory students	231	139	60.2
Male	10,420	8,582	82.4
Female	9,793	8,465	86.4

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP.

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	20,178	12,156	60.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	329	131	39.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	319	209	65.5
Black, non-Hispanic	248	123	49.6
Hispanic	2,926	990	33.8
White, non-Hispanic	16,252	10,642	65.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,013	567	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,205	163	13.5
Economically disadvantaged students	8,824	4,192	47.5
Migratory students	236	51	21.6
Male	10,403	6,454	62.0
Female	9,775	5,702	58.3
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.

1.3.1.4 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	20,641	15,922	77.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	348	213	61.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	288	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	248	150	60.5
Hispanic	2,888	1,664	57.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,728	13,553	81.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,955	708	36.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,142	394	34.5
Economically disadvantaged students	8,600	5,727	66.6
Migratory students	230	130	56.5
Male	10,631	8,140	76.6
Female	10,010	7,782	77.7

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP.

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	20,614	16,835	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	234	67.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	350	287	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	237	168	70.9
Hispanic	2,872	1,829	63.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,731	14,255	85.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,959	802	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,083	426	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	8,575	6,198	72.3
Migratory students	226	120	53.1
Male	10,616	8,484	79.9
Female	9,998	8,351	83.5

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP.

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Idaho assesses science in grades 5,7 and 10.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,250	15,171	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	197	61.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	336	276	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	245	141	57.6
Hispanic	2,833	1,534	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,439	12,974	78.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,810	541	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,093	374	34.2
Economically disadvantaged students	7,979	5,060	63.4
Migratory students	210	107	51.0
Male	10,302	7,671	74.5
Female	9,948	7,500	75.4

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP. Two Idaho districts, Lapwai on the NezPerce Reservation, and Plummer Worley on the Coeur'Alene Reservation made AYP for the first time through safe harbor. These two districts account for 710 of the 2400 students tests and make a sufficient difference to explain the boost in achievement for the statewide population. Plummer Worley School District on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation met AYP for the first time through Safe Harbor. That district enrollment of 470 represents 470/2400 American Indian students tested in grades 3-8 and 10. In this case the achievement of one district is enough to skew the state statistic. Two Idaho districts, Lapwai on the NezPerce Reservation, and Plummer Worley on the Coeur'Alene Reservation made AYP for the first time through safe harbor. These two districts account for 710 of the 2400 students tests and make a sufficient difference to explain the boost in achievement for the statewide population.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,203	16,338	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	215	67.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	326	276	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	232	177	76.3
Hispanic	2,802	1,676	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	16,444	13,938	84.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,816	644	35.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,030	364	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	7,937	5,596	70.5
Migratory students	199	83	41.7
Male	10,273	8,053	78.4
Female	9,930	8,285	83.4

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies

consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP.

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	20,122	10,309	51.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	318	111	34.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	327	205	62.7
Black, non-Hispanic	228	92	40.4
Hispanic	2,804	620	22.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,368	9,255	56.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,784	316	17.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,038	74	7.1
Economically disadvantaged students	7,904	2,916	36.9
Migratory students	202	31	15.3
Male	10,234	5,398	52.7
Female	9,888	4,911	49.7
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.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

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
All students	20,285	15,993	78.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	329	198	60.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	330	279	84.5
Black, non-Hispanic	222	136	61.3
Hispanic	2,708	1,700	62.8
White, non-Hispanic	16,620	13,631	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,812	585	32.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,045	437	41.8
Economically disadvantaged students	7,684	5,217	67.9
Migratory students	187	106	56.7
Male	10,531	8,205	77.9
Female	9,754	7,788	79.8

Comments: The black, Non-Hispanic population in Idaho is so small that small changes create inordinate change in the percentage values. Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted to the Idaho MEP. Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid.

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

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
All students	20,260	17,922	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	329	250	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	325	294	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	212	177	83.5
Hispanic	2,692	2,009	74.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,626	15,128	91.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,817	884	48.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	986	537	54.5
Economically disadvantaged students	7,663	6,257	81.7
Migratory students	185	112	60.5
Male	10,516	9,089	86.4
Female	9,744	8,833	90.7

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The State Director of Assessment and Accountability and the State MEP Coordinator will be working collaboratively to assure Migrant student are coded and accounted for. The following communication will be provided by the Director of Assessment and Accountability: Testing Coordinator newsletters; Testing Coordinator accountability for accuracy; Testing Coordinator's Guide; Testing Coordinator Training for test administration (March 2009). The State MEP Coordinator will provide training to all Migrant Project Directors to assure that testing coordinators receive an updated Migrant student list and documentation of Migrant students who were not tested, due to movement or missing testing window, is submitted

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Idaho assesses Science in grades 5, 7, and 10.			

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

	# 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	19,716	15,173	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	301	171	56.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	335	264	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	213	133	62.4
Hispanic	2,406	1,389	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,407	13,177	80.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,624	513	31.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	931	381	40.9
Economically disadvantaged students	6,143	4,015	65.4
Migratory students	169	84	49.7
Male	10,155	7,836	77.2
Female	9,561	7,337	76.7

Comments: The number of Black, non-Hispanic students in Idaho is so small that any change creates an inordinate change in the percentages. Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Two Idaho districts, Lapwai on the NezPerce Reservation, and Plummer Worley on the Coeur'Alene Reservation made AYP for the first time through safe harbor. These two districts account for 710 of the 2400 students tests and make a sufficient difference to explain the boost in achievement for the statewide population. Plummer Worley School District on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation met AYP for the first time through Safe Harbor. That district enrollment of 470 represents 470/2400 American Indian students tested in grades 3-8 and 10. In this case the achievement of one district is enough to skew the state statistic. Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid.

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

	# 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	19,669	16,899	85.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	295	215	72.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	320	266	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	208	163	78.4
Hispanic	2,394	1,615	67.5
White, non-Hispanic	16,400	14,596	89.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,623	719	44.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	870	406	46.7
Economically disadvantaged students	6,119	4,703	76.9
Migratory students	167	78	46.7
Male	10,128	8,509	84.0
Female	9,541	8,390	87.9

Comments: Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Idaho's Migrant count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. Migrant count is valid. Two Idaho districts, Lapwai on the NezPerce Reservation, and Plummer Worley on the Coeur'Alene Reservation made AYP for the first time through safe harbor. These two ditrices assount for 710 of the 2400 students tests and make a sufficien difference to explain the boost in achievement for the statewide population. Plummer Worley School Didtrict on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation met AYP for the first time through Safe Harbor. That district enrollment of 470 represents 470/2400 American Indian students tested in grades 3-8 and 10. In this case the achievement of one district

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	19,543	13,121	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	293	125	42.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	319	217	68.0
Black, non-Hispanic	204	113	55.4
Hispanic	2,371	977	41.2
White, non-Hispanic	16,305	11,659	71.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,591	419	26.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	889	203	22.8
Economically disadvantaged students	6,063	3,275	54.0
Migratory students	167	53	31.7
Male	10,063	6,954	69.1
Female	9,480	6,167	65.1
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	648	362	55.9
Districts	130	56	43.1
Comments: Idaho saw great gains in proficiency rates this past year due to frozen proficiency targets, and great efforts made in technical assistance throughout the state. Additionally, many Idaho schools and districts were able to meet AYP through Safe Harbor. Data is correct.			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	376	194	51.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	201	91	45.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	175	103	58.9
Comments: Idaho saw great gains in proficiency rates this past year due to frozen proficiency targets, and great efforts made in technical assistance throughout the state. Additionally, many Idaho schools and districts were able to meet AYP through Safe Harbor. Data is correct.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
120	49	40.8
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 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	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: We did not collect this specific data, but we will collect this data next year.	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: We did not collect this specific data, but we will collect this data next year.	

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.

We did not collect this specific data, but we will collect this data next year.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School/District Improvement Planning Regional Workshops:

Over 140 teachers, principals, and district administrators attended the five 1-day School/District Improvement Plan Writing Workshops that were offered regionally in October, 2007. Based on Spring '07 ISAT results, some Idaho schools who were identified as Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action, brought a team of three or four staff members, including the chief administrator, to the training.

Additional 1-hour, one-on-one sessions were offered to provide assistance with writing their plan. Representatives from the SDE and other distinguished educators were available to provide feedback and support during their planning process.

Participants were able to work on their own online plan via wireless technology made available. Support was targeted to schools/district as it related to their designation. Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action.

The plan writing workshop included the following elements:

- The technical aspects of entering the plan in the online tool, as well as

- Additional training in planning for Continuous School Improvement that is specific to school/district data

- SDE staff Specialists in Migrant, ELL, Family Involvement, reading and math interventions, Three Tier Model, etc. was available to assist teams in planning writing.

CIP Tool Support Webinars:

Over 50 participants registered to attend six 1-hour webinars that were offered in September, 2007 for those who were new to the school improvement process, or who were still struggling to navigate the CIP Tool. Participants were walked through the School Improvement Plan portion of the CIP Tool in small groups.

One-on-One Technical Assistance:

Additional one-on-one technical assistance was provided on an individual basis as requested by schools and districts, or as identified by the State Department.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	
Comments: We did not collect this specific data, but we will next year.	

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	0	0
Comments: No appeals were filed.		

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	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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	9,287	9,343
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	6,349	5,775
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	68.4	61.8
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	7,079	6,339
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	76.2	67.8
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	27	
Comments: Total number of students who were enrolled only includes students enrolled in State ISAT testing grades 3 thru 8 and 10 in the October 1 , SY0708 Total Membership/Enrollment State counts.		

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	6
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	21
Comments: Only includes the 27 schools listed in 1.4.8.1.	

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
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementaion can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.
						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementaion can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.
						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementaion can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.
						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementaion can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.
						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementaion can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.

						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementation can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.
						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementation can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.

						Idaho was not prepared to track strategies implemented with fidelity in a way that implementation can be linked to student outcomes. Idaho will track that information or 08-09.
--	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Comments: Idaho Department of Education launched a pilot support system, Building Capacity, with the additional school improvement funds for the 0708 school year. Data will be tracked and reported beginning next year.

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

831.

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.

School Improvement strategies were shared with LEAs and schools through regional school improvement workshops, teleconferences, webinars, and one-on-one technical assistance visits and meetings. Additionally, feedback was provided through narrative comments and a scoring rubric used to evaluate the quality of strategies being used in school improvement plans.

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: Idaho followed the formula and set-aside 4%.

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 1003g funds were used to support Idaho's emerging statewide system of support, the Idaho Building Capacity project. Through this project, 19 school and district sites were served at an increased level that included up to 8 hours a week on-site assistance from an outside trained consultant, professional development, and additional resources. 5% was utilized for administrative support, and 95% flowed through to districts, which the used to support services of the Idaho Building Capacity project.

Idaho was not prepared to collect data of strategies implements so that they could be linked to student proficiency gains.

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.

Many SDE programs such as Migrant, LEP, Title IIa, Title IV, and Special Education work together with school improvement to utilize all available resources to best support LEAs and schools in need of improvement.

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	44,065
Applied to transfer	85
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	40

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
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	\$ 34,067
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	64
Comments: Due to the remote nature of Idaho, and the high number of schools and LEAs in improvement, these districts were not able to offer choice.	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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	21,464
Applied for supplemental educational services	490
Received supplemental educational services	480
Comments: Notus school district made an error in data submission. Actual data reported is 60 requested and 60 served. That will change the total requested to 490 and balance the chart.	

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	\$ 349,443
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	34,852	32,432	93.1	2,420	6.9
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	2,368	2,227	94.0	141	6.0
Low-poverty schools	2,395	2,212	92.4	183	7.6
All elementary schools	9,712	9,017	92.8	695	7.2
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	4,285	3,798	88.6	487	11.4
Low-poverty schools	6,800	6,396	94.1	404	5.9
All secondary schools	25,140	23,415	93.1	1,725	6.9
Comments:					

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.

No

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

Programming changes for IBEDS were implemented prior to the 2008 data collection. For the first time, districts reported special education classes taught by special education teachers who were providing direct instruction in core academic subjects. However, in trying to disaggregate the information collected from the districts, it became clear that the program did not provide accurate reports. While we know that 404 classes were offered by Special Education teachers providing direct instruction in core academic areas, we cannot clearly calculate the content specific information or the total number of classes that were taught by NON-HQT teachers.

Ongoing changes to the reporting programs are being made so that data tables will be accurate in '09 CSPR Report, and will include special education teachers providing direct instruction in content areas.

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.

Full-day self-contained elementary 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	77.1
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	19.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	3.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	74.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	18.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	61.3	35.8
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	52.3	24.6
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced 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
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho categorizes Two Way Immersion and Developmental Bilingual as the same.

The "Other" category would include: extended day or all day kindergarten; language development instruction intervention provided by classroom teachers in consultation with ELL teachers; and study skills.

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	18,358
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.	16,524
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	15,187
Shoshone	270
Russian	263
Bosnian	164
Serbo-Croatian	133

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

331 students were categorized as "other/unknown".

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	16,671
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,687
Total	18,358
Comments: The main reasons why students were not tested were because they were absent during the entire testing window (i.e. Migrant students) or they left the district/state.	

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	2,514
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	13.7
Comments: Idaho has calculated the percent proficient or above on the State annual ELP assessment by how many students tested, not by how many students were tested, plus the number of students not tested. Therefore, Idaho's percent proficient would be 15.8%. Idaho believes it is not an accurate reflection of proficiency to calculate a percentage that includes students who did not test because they left the district/state or were absent during the entire testing window.	

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	15,121
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,403
Total	16,524
Comments: The main reasons why students were not tested were because they were absent during the entire testing window (i.e. Migrant students) or they left the district/state.	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	3,684	24.4
ELP attainment	2,223	14.7
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Idaho does not offer any content area test in another language other than English.

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Idaho does not offer any content area test in another language other than English.

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,291	1,717	4,008
Comments: These numbers above include all monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students in grades K-12.		

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
2,339	1,935	82.7	404
Comments: These numbers above include all monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students in grades 3-8 and 10 only.			

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
2,343	2,029	86.6	314
Comments: These numbers above include all monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students in grades 3-8 and 10 only.			

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
138	72	52.2	66
Comments: These numbers above include all monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students in grades 3-8 and 10 only.			

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	37
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	6
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	14
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	20
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	37
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
Comments: All 37 subgrantees of Title III funds that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years (06-07 and 07-08) will be implementing an improvement plan in 08-09.	

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:	

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
3,188	1,819	15

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 EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,094
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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	37	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	31	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	28	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	36	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	27	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	34	5,646
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	35	469
PD provided to principals	33	231
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	28	204
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	32	1,066
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	591
Total	37	8,207

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are a total of 37 subgrantees of Title III funds, therefore the total in the # of subgrantees for the participant information above is 37, rather than the combined total of 174.

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
07/08/08	07/08/08	1
Comments: Idaho uses a quarterly cash balance report process for the request of monthly federal funds. Each subgrantee is required to submit a report by the 15th of July, October, January and March. Payments are made immediately after the district request is received for each of these months and on the 1st of the second two months. Therefore funding is made available immediately for subgrantees and is distributed monthly.		

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.

Idaho has implemented a process that makes funds available immediately, therefore does not need to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

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: Idaho Schools are working hard to prevent school violence. Heavy emphasis is placed on prevention of bullying and encouraging acts of kindness.	

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	88.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	82.9
Hispanic	76.3
White, non-Hispanic	89.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	81.4
Limited English proficient	82.9
Economically disadvantaged	88.5
Migratory students	61.2
Male	86.8
Female	89.8
Comments:	

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	2.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2.5
Hispanic	5.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.6
Limited English proficient	3.9
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	3.4
Male	2.3
Female	2.2
Comments: Cannot calculate a dropout event rate for the Economically Disadvantaged student group as grade level information on total enrollment data is not collected.	

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	123	123
LEAs with subgrants	7	7
Total	130	130
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)	10	18
K	72	113
1	82	110
2	56	148
3	81	141
4	72	106
5	63	112
6	50	101
7	51	72
8	56	48
9	51	105
10	48	76
11	52	59
12	85	87
Ungraded	0	0
Total	829	1,296
Comments: Idaho will ensure that "undgraded" data for non-sub grant LEAs will be collected for the 2008-2009 school year.		

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	68	190
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	626	908
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	111	91
Hotels/Motels	24	107
Total	829	1,296
Comments:		

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)	68
K	86
1	93
2	116
3	109
4	88
5	86
6	63
7	58
8	40
9	78
10	70
11	56
12	84
Ungraded	56
Total	1,151
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	29
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	156
Limited English proficient students	100
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	5
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	4
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	6
Counseling	5
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	6
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other (optional -in comment box below) -District 271 reported 1 -Financial Education Planning Services

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	2
School Selection	0
Transportation	2
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

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	87	40
4	73	34
5	66	37
6	58	36
7	40	19
8	29	16
High School	123	69
Comments: Did not use the pre-population. The counts used are from the State Homeless data collection which for SY 0708 more accurately report the assessment information for the Homeless category. Note that High School counts include grades 9 thru 12.		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	87	57
4	73	47
5	66	45
6	58	31
7	40	30
8	29	15
High School	104	81
Comments: Did not use the pre-population. The counts used are from the State Homeless data collection which for SY 0708 more accurately report the assessment information for the Homeless category. Note that High School counts include grades 9 thru 12.		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	835
K	330
1	438
2	404
3	330
4	355
5	313
6	324
7	296
8	303
9	280
10	236
11	151
12	127
Ungraded	77
Out-of-school	244
Total	5,043
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho's child count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. More families are settling permanently in their home base. Families whose eligibility has expired are no longer seeking and/or obtaining qualifying work. Furthermore, issues surrounding immigration have made it more difficult to find and recruit eligible families as they choose to remain isolated and private out of fear. Lastly, less migrant families are moving to the state of Idaho due to the impact of the immigration issues.

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)	204
K	144
1	219
2	183
3	138
4	173
5	134
6	116
7	68
8	39
9	32
10	17
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	11
Total	1,493
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.

Idaho's child count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. More families are settling permanently in their home base. Families whose eligibility has expired are no longer seeking and/or obtaining qualifying work. Furthermore, issues surrounding immigration have made it more difficult to find and recruit eligible families as they choose to remain isolated and private out of fear. Lastly, less migrant families are moving to the state of Idaho due to the impact of the immigration issues.

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.

The Idaho State Migrant Student Information System has been in use for close to 5 years now. The system was built by contract and in-house resources and is a secure web application using SQL 2005 to house data. The system generates and compiles reports using SQL queries on the Student level information. The system was used to compile and report Idaho's Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts for SY0708 and SY0607.

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.

Idaho utilizes the following people to collect and manage the child count data: 8 Migrant Regional Coordinators, 1 Migrant data administrator and IT management (Federal Data Manager Programmer Project Manager) at the State level. The Migrant system collects details on student demographics, student enrollment, movement history, regular and summer services being provided, test scores, secondary grades/credits and immunization records on active students enrolled in the State's MEP program. Each year the system is rolled over and all students are re-qualified and re-certified by the Regional Coordinators and districts for accurate counts. The rollover of the Migrant application for SY 06-07 occurred in November 2007 and in December 2008 for SY 07-08. Prior to the rollover, Regional Coordinators are required to verify migrant student information and reconcile Migrant student counts with each district. District reports are populated through the system that the Regional Coordinators and each MEP district use to verify student counts and student data.

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

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Migrant data administrator is the only person who can add new students to the MSIS with a valid COE. Identity search functions in the system are used to insure that a new student does not already exist in the Migrant Student Information System. If the student does not exist in the system, the data administrator enters the new student using the information collected on the COE and adds an enrollment history record for the current location of the student. If the student exists, the data administrator manages the enrollment history record for that student and updates Student Demographic details and Student Enrollment details, as needed. If there is a duplicate, IT management is contacted with specific instructions for removing duplicate information. Regional Coordinators update all student information as needed, but do not have the ability to add new students. A request must be made to the Migrant data administrator for removal of duplicate information. Regional Coordinators and districts use the district reports to validate counts. IT management uses the same reports and queries to organize the child counts for all reporting purposes.

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.

Not Applicable

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.

Children are counted if they reach 3 years old by the end of the eligible period 8/31/2008 for SY 0708 and if they are not older than 21 at the start of the eligible period 9/1/2007 for SY 07-08. This is done by queries when the reports are generated and compiled.

Students are activated for the SY 07-08 by the Regional Coordinators and Migrant data administrator if they are active as a resident or student for at least one day from 9/1/2007 to 8/31/2008 for the SY 07-08.

The District reports do not display children whose: QA date generates an eligibility date that does not fall into the range of 9/1/2007 to 8/31/2008 for SY 07-08 and the EOE data is out of range for SY 07-08.

Summer students are marked on the same student record and cannot be included again in the regular school year count. The district reports include validation for Summer and Regular year students and their services.

There is only one age/grade category for each student, and the State queries return counts based on this fact to insure that migrant student counts are compiled only once per grade.

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.

Not Applicable

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.

Before students are entered into the system or existing students' information is updated, the IMEP migrant data administrator reviews each new COE to ensure that all necessary information is provided by checking each qualifying activity to assure it is valid, time of year that the move was made and if the activity is done in the area that the move was made to. The data administrator then enters the data from the COE into the Idaho computerized data system. The Regional Coordinators update the existing student data for their assigned districts to maintain records and re-qualify eligible students. When a question or concern of possible duplication arises, Regional Coordinators contact the State Migrant data administrator for resolution. The State Migrant data administrator compares the COE data to what is in the computerized data system and makes any necessary changes or deletions so that the child count is accurate.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has a statewide COE. Regional recruiters and district family liaisons determine student eligibility by interviewing the parents, guardians, or other responsible adult(s) of potential migrant students. In addition, regional recruiters and family liaisons interview the person directly if he or she is self eligible for the Migrant Education Program. The IMEP was administered by an Acting Coordinator through June 2008. The new IMEP Coordinator began July 2008. As a result of this inconsistency of a State Coordinator, Idaho has not had the manpower or full time Coordinator to ensure that quality control was taking place through the SY 07-08. Title I-C monitoring visits have been the only assured activity for quality control. The new MEP Coordinator has recently created the Flow of the COE and will continue to develop quality control procedures, including the Re-Interview process as mandated by new MEP regulations. MERC will be in Idaho in March to provide family recruiters/liaisons with professional development in Identification and Recruitment.

Added 3/13/2009 Regional Coordinators are provided with training in summer/intersession data collection as a component of the training received throughout the year. Written procedures are not in place at this time. However, this is an area Idaho will implement for SY 09-10.

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.

No re-interviewing was done in the SY 2007-08 academic year due to a changing administration and loss and change of migrant personnel. The current IMEP coordinator began in July 2008. A re-interviewing process is being developed for 08-09 student counts.

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.

The districts and Regional Coordinators work together to re-certify and re-qualify students throughout the year. District reports (in real time) are accessible for both district staff and Regional Coordinators to view. Updates to student information can only be updated by the Regional Coordinators or the State Migrant administrators as needed. This allows for checks and balances that only eligible children are being served and counted for the State MEP Program.

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Migrant Coordinator verifies with Regional Coordinators that all child counts met the OME criteria for eligibility. The Migrant data administrator reports to the State Migrant Coordinator on the status of data entry of eligible COEs and any corrections and/or deletions of non-eligible students. The State Migrant Coordinator and data administrator collaborate with the EDFacts Coordinator to review final child counts and all pertinent information so that accuracy is ensured.

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.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has taken steps to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations. Regional Coordinators will be re-trained in ID&R processes. District personnel working with the Migrant Program will also be trained by MERC and the Regional Coordinators in ID&R to ensure consistency across all programs. The State Migrant Coordinator will monitor identification and recruitment in districts to assure that Regional Coordinators and district personnel involved in eligibility determinations are following the OME criteria and guidelines for qualifying a student for the migrant program. COEs will be continually verified and collaboration with the EDFacts Coordinator will help maintain accuracy of student eligibility.

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

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A concern Idaho has about the accuracy of the reported child counts is the timeline and understanding of districts in providing the necessary and accurate information needed to report correct numbers to OME. Also, Idaho is concerned with having a more efficient means of data collection and reporting to enable districts to spend more time helping the children and families in the MEP.

Added March 13, 2009

Idaho is confident that the quality of the data is high, nevertheless.

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