

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

OHIO



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

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

Address:
25 S. Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4183

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Barry L. Bentley, Director, Office of Quality Assurance

Telephone: 614-728-7851

Fax: 614-752-1622

e-mail: barry.bentley@ode.state.oh.us

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

Deborah S. Delisle, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Friday, March 13, 2009, 11:51:44 AM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Ohio is currently conducting an international benchmarking study in science and mathematics with the intent of applying the findings to revisions to the academic content standards in those areas beginning in late 2009 and extending until early 2011. Specific timelines are difficult to project due to impacts of budget cuts, but revisions to the content standards should be complete by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

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.

Ohio is engaged in a pilot program for performance-based assessments in English, mathematics and science for grades 11 and 12. Findings from the pilot will inform the design of Ohio's next generation of assessments at the high school level. Districts selected for the pilot will begin work on designing performance tasks in February 2009. The pilot will continue through the 2010-2011 school year.

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.

Ohio is engaged in a pilot program for performance-based assessments in English, mathematics and science for grades 11 and 12. Findings from the pilot will inform the design of Ohio's next generation of assessments at the high school level. Districts selected for the pilot will begin work on designing performance tasks in February 2009. The pilot will continue through the 2010-2011 school year.

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	950,899	945,892	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,376	1,362	99.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,691	13,655	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	156,423	154,084	98.5
Hispanic	24,368	24,194	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	722,955	720,735	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	144,838	143,195	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,443	18,339	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	369,286	366,513	99.2
Migratory students	378	375	99.2
Male	488,111	485,082	99.4
Female	462,788	460,810	99.6
Comments: Multiracial -> 64,471 students enrolled; 64,032 students participating.			

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	48,372	33.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	76,904	53.8
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	17,629	12.3

Total	142,905	
-------	---------	--

Comments: In addition to the above, 28 IDEA students took the regular mathematics assessment at an accelerated grade level, 123 took the regular mathematics assessment with LEP accommodations, and 139 took the regular mathematics assessment with 504 accommodations.

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	955,663	950,726	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,385	1,370	98.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,532	13,504	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	157,575	155,280	98.5
Hispanic	24,388	24,204	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	726,398	724,198	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	145,593	143,980	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,773	17,654	99.3
Economically disadvantaged students	372,246	369,536	99.3
Migratory students	406	405	99.8
Male	490,530	487,542	99.4
Female	465,133	463,184	99.6
Comments: Multiracial -> 32,385 students enrolled; 32,170 students participating.			

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	49,584	34.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	76,517	53.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	17,626	12.3
Total	143,727	
Comments: In addition to the above, 4 IDEA students took the regular reading assessment at an accelerated grade level, 106 took the regular reading assessment with LEP accommodations, and 143 took the regular reading assessment with 504 accommodations.		

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	416,112	411,954	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	596	587	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,531	5,514	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	69,461	67,477	97.1
Hispanic	10,011	9,857	98.5
White, non-Hispanic	318,294	316,463	99.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	63,320	62,071	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,733	6,671	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	152,692	150,389	98.5
Migratory students	158	154	97.5
Male	213,845	211,354	98.8
Female	202,267	200,600	99.2
Comments: Multiracial -> 12,219 students enrolled; 12,056 students participating.			

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	21,365	34.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	33,043	53.3
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	7,553	12.2
Total	61,961	
Comments: In addition to the above, 3 IDEA students took the regular science assessment at an accelerated grade level, 56 took the regular science assessment with LEP accommodations, and 51 took the regular science assessment with 504 accommodations.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	132,093	104,667	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	212	159	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,131	1,899	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	21,333	11,482	53.8
Hispanic	3,776	2,391	63.3
White, non-Hispanic	99,003	84,476	85.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,206	11,028	57.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,459	2,129	61.5
Economically disadvantaged students	56,121	37,581	67.0
Migratory students	52	31	59.6
Male	67,541	53,804	79.7
Female	64,552	50,863	78.8
Comments: Multiracial -> 4,260/5,638 = 75.6%			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	137,471	106,426	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	223	162	72.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,180	1,870	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22,670	12,777	56.4
Hispanic	4,014	2,487	62.0
White, non-Hispanic	102,428	84,713	82.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,971	11,095	55.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,376	1,982	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	59,482	38,826	65.3
Migratory students	85	45	52.9
Male	70,271	52,694	75.0
Female	67,200	53,732	80.0
Comments: Multiracial -> 4,417/5,956 = 74.2%			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	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: Science tests are given only in grades 5, 8, 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.

1.3.1.2 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	132,413	98,758	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	149	73.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,162	1,910	88.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21,446	10,520	49.1
Hispanic	3,776	2,242	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	99,535	80,317	80.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,451	9,880	48.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,227	1,906	59.1
Economically disadvantaged students	55,508	33,711	60.7
Migratory students	53	30	56.6
Male	67,716	50,438	74.5
Female	64,697	48,320	74.7
Comments: Multiracial -> 3,620/5,291 = 68.4%			

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	132,269	107,290	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	157	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,107	1,897	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21,425	12,632	59.0
Hispanic	3,727	2,558	68.6
White, non-Hispanic	99,515	85,883	86.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,443	11,918	58.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,969	1,930	65.0
Economically disadvantaged students	55,435	38,436	69.3
Migratory students	53	35	66.0
Male	67,643	53,923	79.7
Female	64,626	53,367	82.6
Comments: Multiracial -> 4,163/5,292 = 78.7%			

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: Science tests are given only in grades 5, 8, 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	130,949	80,898	61.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	107	61.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,930	1,602	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,837	6,709	32.2
Hispanic	3,468	1,537	44.3
White, non-Hispanic	99,633	68,303	68.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,144	7,096	35.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,803	1,259	44.9
Economically disadvantaged students	53,134	23,694	44.6
Migratory students	41	11	26.8
Male	67,508	41,959	62.2
Female	63,441	38,939	61.4
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,640/4,907 = 53.8%			

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	130,813	95,002	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	173	126	72.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,873	1,619	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20,818	9,335	44.8
Hispanic	3,426	2,015	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	99,615	78,553	78.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,145	8,741	43.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,566	1,328	51.8
Economically disadvantaged students	53,068	30,608	57.7
Migratory students	40	16	40.0
Male	67,436	47,386	70.3
Female	63,377	47,616	75.1
Comments: Multiracial -> 3,354/4,908 = 68.3%			

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	130,880	86,918	66.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	112	64.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,924	1,588	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,824	7,068	33.9
Hispanic	3,462	1,652	47.7
White, non-Hispanic	99,589	73,576	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,124	9,115	45.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,795	1,217	43.5
Economically disadvantaged students	53,095	26,002	49.0
Migratory students	41	15	36.6
Male	67,455	45,394	67.3
Female	63,425	41,524	65.5
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,922/4,907 = 59.5%			

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

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	132,126	101,232	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	142	76.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,958	1,791	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21,272	10,395	48.9
Hispanic	3,391	2,089	61.6
White, non-Hispanic	100,775	83,573	82.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,470	9,340	45.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,652	1,549	58.4
Economically disadvantaged students	52,045	32,071	61.6
Migratory students	48	28	58.3
Male	67,888	51,937	76.5
Female	64,238	49,295	76.7
Comments: Multiracial -> 3,242/4,545 = 71.3%			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	132,110	105,223	79.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	144	77.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,932	1,742	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	21,242	12,364	58.2
Hispanic	3,359	2,287	68.1
White, non-Hispanic	100,853	85,197	84.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,471	10,105	49.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,442	1,479	60.6
Economically disadvantaged students	51,992	34,620	66.6
Migratory students	48	31	64.6
Male	67,876	51,402	75.7
Female	64,234	53,821	83.8
Comments: Multiracial -> 3,490/4,538 = 76.9%			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	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: Science tests are given only in grades 5, 8, 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	136,601	93,906	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	113	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,895	1,664	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22,223	8,509	38.3
Hispanic	3,355	1,740	51.9
White, non-Hispanic	104,641	79,177	75.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,802	7,444	35.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,310	1,117	48.4
Economically disadvantaged students	52,023	26,811	51.5
Migratory students	63	40	63.5
Male	70,140	48,202	68.7
Female	66,461	45,704	68.8
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,703/4,311 = 62.7%			

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	136,585	105,505	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	127	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,860	1,631	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22,230	11,940	53.7
Hispanic	3,314	2,032	61.3
White, non-Hispanic	104,690	86,539	82.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,812	9,071	43.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,100	1,085	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	52,001	32,825	63.1
Migratory students	62	40	64.5
Male	70,158	51,336	73.2
Female	66,427	54,169	81.5
Comments: Multiracial -> 3,236/4,315 = 75.0%			

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	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: Science tests are given only in grades 5, 8, 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.

1.3.1.6 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	138,590	100,855	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	215	146	67.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,872	1,692	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,549	10,739	45.6
Hispanic	3,342	1,931	57.8
White, non-Hispanic	105,658	83,697	79.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,086	7,913	37.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,146	1,141	53.2
Economically disadvantaged students	51,921	29,482	56.8
Migratory students	69	41	59.4
Male	71,311	51,236	71.8
Female	67,279	49,619	73.8
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,650/3,954 = 67.0%			

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	138,469	109,871	79.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	152	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,856	1,669	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,523	13,664	58.1
Hispanic	3,306	2,185	66.1
White, non-Hispanic	105,617	89,138	84.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,105	9,514	45.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,931	1,067	55.3
Economically disadvantaged students	51,856	34,153	65.9
Migratory students	69	45	65.2
Male	71,241	53,851	75.6
Female	67,228	56,020	83.3
Comments: Multiracial -> 3,063/3,953 = 77.5%			

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

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	138,418	86,105	62.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	119	55.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,888	1,514	80.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,470	6,764	28.8
Hispanic	3,337	1,403	42.0
White, non-Hispanic	105,563	74,125	70.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,036	7,155	34.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,144	746	34.8
Economically disadvantaged students	51,816	22,168	42.8
Migratory students	69	32	46.4
Male	71,201	45,191	63.5
Female	67,217	40,914	60.9
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,180/3,944 = 55.3%			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	143,140	113,065	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	151	76.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,707	1,565	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,429	12,579	53.7
Hispanic	3,086	2,061	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	111,504	94,335	84.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,036	8,688	41.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,742	929	53.3
Economically disadvantaged students	45,768	29,602	64.7
Migratory students	49	24	49.0
Male	72,991	57,696	79.0
Female	70,149	55,369	78.9
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,374/3,217 = 73.8%			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	143,028	121,765	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	162	83.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,696	1,543	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	23,376	16,092	68.8
Hispanic	3,059	2,303	75.3
White, non-Hispanic	111,493	99,007	88.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,032	10,462	49.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,586	868	54.7
Economically disadvantaged students	45,709	33,933	74.2
Migratory students	48	17	35.4
Male	72,928	59,881	82.1
Female	70,100	61,884	88.3
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,658/3,209 = 82.8%			

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	142,670	103,849	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	136	69.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,702	1,409	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23,185	9,930	42.8
Hispanic	3,059	1,739	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	111,322	88,475	79.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,911	8,183	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,732	639	36.9
Economically disadvantaged students	45,482	25,431	55.9
Migratory students	44	12	27.3
Male	72,706	54,148	74.5
Female	69,964	49,701	71.0
Comments: Multiracial -> 2,160/3,205 = 67.4%			

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	3,765	2,414	64.1
Districts	612	316	51.6
Comments:			

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	2,075	1,193	57.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	985	448	45.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,090	745	68.4
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
590	295	50.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

- See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data. Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	59
Extension of the school year or school day	10
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	27
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	30
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	71
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	39
Comments: "Replacement of principal" not collected.	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	11
Comments:	

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

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New Principal and Leadership -New faces in leadership to change the current governance of the school

Schools that are more Data Driven -Creation of committees to examine and scrutinize standardized test scores -Discussion groups comprised of both parents and staff to analyze the data -Students are keeping a log and record the time spent on reading and math - Series of Benchmark Assessments have been created throughout the school year -Individual school AYP meetings are held to share data and strategies with both parents and staff

Increased Communication with Families -Support groups formed to address problems that may appear at home that are relevant to academic progress -Groups have been formed to help parents with test-taking strategies for their children

Changes in School Grade Span and Appearance -School grade spans have changed in order to reduce classroom sizes -Focus groups have been created in order to spend more time with students in the core content areas -Intervention specialists have been hired to oversee the focus groups -Student reading and math levels were assessed early in the school year to make a determination if the students may require intervention services in order to meet Ohio standards

Increased Professional Development -Weekly professional development training opportunities now available -Increased student-teacher relations have led to increased student performance Creation of a Support Team -Team includes one administrator, two teachers called

instructional planners -Support team will work with the school leadership team to provide professional development and support in areas of weakness

Restriction of School Governance -Restructured the governance of the school itself -Assignment of a school improvement director to mentor and coach the building principal -Added additional intervention specialists -Voluntary staff reduction in order to decrease unnecessary bureaucracy -Reduced fiscal management and deferred to a support committee

Extension of Instructional Time -Both the school day and the school year have been extended

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.

The Ohio Department of Education through its Office of Field Relations is implementing a statewide system of support for school improvement services. The primary focus of the system is to support district leadership to build the capacity to help their low performing schools improve.

The system is deployed through 16 Regional State Support Teams (SSTs). These teams identify strategic and focused support for district leaders by:

- Further analyzing the raw data that resulted in the August 2007 Report Card results to determine specific academic needs including the performance of subgroups;

- Creating district profiles of priority districts and their low performing schools using information from discussion with the district leadership team and a review of district accountability data;

- Creating a plan for each service delivery area to provide professional development and technical assistance targeted first to priority districts; and

- Deploying services and evaluating their effectiveness.

During the 2007-08 school year technical assistance based on student performance data is deployed strategically to those districts most in need, prioritized as follows:

- Districts with buildings in School Improvement Status (SIS);

- Districts with buildings in At Risk Status or SI Delay status;

- Districts with buildings that met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two years and have recently exited School Improvement status; and

- Districts in Improvement Status Academic Watch or Academic Emergency (not already identified in the other priority areas).

Resources provided to districts to support their schools include the services of a School Improvement Facilitator (SIF). SIFs as members of the Regional State Support Team assist district leadership in developing and implementing their district and school improvement plans. For districts with low performing schools SIFs help district and school leadership align their improvement efforts. Additionally other state products programs and services are strategically targeted to those districts to support their low performing schools. For example state professional development training in reading instruction is targeted to the following:

- Helping district and school leadership in understanding the initiative and the role that leadership plays to support teachers in using the information to improve classroom practice; and

- Assuring a critical mass of educators in those schools participate in the initiatives to assure that there is an ongoing professional dialogue that extends beyond the training with a resulting impact on educator practice and ultimately student achievement.

Additionally Title I served schools identified for improvement are eligible for targeted Title I school improvement funds. Those schools are to employ academic coaches (educational leaders) who are employed by the district through an entity other than the district to work with internal Building Coaches building staff and building leadership to increase ongoing capacity to implement standards-based education. Building coaches work with district coaches to ensure efforts at the building and district are aligned.

We are also piloting 54 Math Specialists (now in year two) in buildings that are in Title I served and SI status in Math according to the latest Local Report Card. These Specialists receive intensive technical assistance from Ohio State University to develop the district's capacity to deliver high quality instruction in mathematics. They then coach the other math teachers in their buildings to increase the collective content and instructional knowledge of all teachers in the area of mathematics.

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	36
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	46
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	47
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:	

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	1	0
Schools	5	1
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	07/28/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	68,988	71,960
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	27,420	29,623
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	39.7	41.2
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	32,213	34,474
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	46.7	47.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	279	
Comments:		

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

1.4.8.2 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	58
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	29
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	221
Comments:	

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
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.
2		41	4	11	D	Literacy: Increase in teachers content and pedagogical understandings.
2		75	29	18	D	Math: Increase in teachers content and pedagogical understandings.
Comments:						

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</p>

comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other Source

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The literacy consultant and mathematics coaching strategies were supported by two separate ODE offices. Since the coaching projects were in their fourth and second years of implementation respectively, the two offices decided to develop a joint communication specifically targeted to new districts and schools receiving Title I funds. The joint communication explained the purposes of the coaching model, expectations and contact information. In the case of literacy, a literacy contact person in each of the 16 state defined regions met with superintendents and other district staff to help them understand the coaching model and to answer implementation questions. The mathematics coaching model conversations were restricted to areas of the state where coaching supports were already in place.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable.

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.

The literacy consultant model and the mathematics coaching model (see 1.4.8.4) were both supported by state funds. The literacy consultant model provided additional direct funding to support literacy consultants in each of the state's 16 regions plus additional direct grants to buildings to help cover the costs of the model. In the case of the mathematics coaching model, state funds supported the Ohio State University development, technical assistance and ongoing supports and evaluation. The state system of support was primarily funded by state general revenue funds. These funds provided for regional school improvement team members to help districts analyze data, develop improvement plans and build their capacity to help their buildings. In many cases, the state funds supported improvement strategies articulated in the district improvement plans.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	226,345
Applied to transfer	10,202
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	5,355

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 10,253,398
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	62
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school³ that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	128,318
Applied for supplemental educational services	21,970
Received supplemental educational services	15,856
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 21,452,505
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	557,878	549,779	98.5	8,099	1.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	82,787	80,548	97.3	2,239	2.7
Low-poverty schools	91,041	90,789	99.7	252	0.3
All elementary schools	282,815	280,349	99.1	2,466	0.9
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	38,705	36,626	94.6	2,079	5.4
Low-poverty schools	66,540	66,196	99.5	344	0.5
All secondary schools	275,063	269,430	98.0	5,633	2.0
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.

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state uses departmentalized classrooms where each class is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

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	50.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	15.8
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified.

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)	32.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	33.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	17.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified.

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	61.9	22.8
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	
Secondary schools	51.6	16.5
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- 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.*
- 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:

- 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>.**
- 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	French, Mandarin, Somali, Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	French, Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Arabic, Cambodian, Chinese, French, Hindi, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Vietnamese, Ukrainian
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Russian, Somali, Spanish, Ukrainian
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.

LEAs provided the following descriptions of other services not captured by the list above:

- After-school ESL tutoring.
- Newcomer Program for refugee and overage students provided intensive ESL and academic support.
- In-class support (inclusion) with trained ESL teacher and/or instructional assistant.
- Push-in: in-class coaching/tutoring and academic support.
- Immersion in the regular (English) classrooms with assistance from pull-out bilingual (Spanish) tutor and individual tutoring.

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	38,026
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.	36,496
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	16,244
Other	8,677
Somali	3,647
Arabic	2,141
German	1,622

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

Other languages with significant numbers of LEP student:

-Japanese -1069 -
Russian -721 -
Vietnam -718 -
Korean -694 -
Ukrainian -624

The current data element that ODE collects is 'Students' Native Language', which by current definition is: "Native" or first language of the student. This is often the language spoken at home but should denote the primary language spoken by the student at the onset of speech. This definition does not correctly correlate with the question asked therefore; beginning FY10 the longitudinal data system will begin to

collect the Student Home Language element in order to complete this report (and the EDEN files requiring this data) properly. Although, the change will be made next for FY10, the data reported above is reported using the same business rules as in years' past for consistency.

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	32,850
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,176
Total	38,026
Comments: The 32,850 count of students in section 1.6.3.1.1 represents students in grades K through 12 that took the Ohio's English Language Acquisition Assessment (OTELA) at the SEA level. This count is different than Section 1.2 because those students are in the AYP grades only, which are grades 3 through 8 and 10. Results in 1.6.3.1.1 include KG, 1, 2, 9, 11, and 12 grades additionally.	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3,266
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	8.6
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	31,560
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,936
Total	36,496
Comments: The 31,560 count of students in section 1.6.3.2.1 represents students in grades K through 12 that took the Ohio's English Language Acquisition Assessment (OTELA) at the LEA level that receive Title III funding. This count is different than Section 1.2 because those students are in the AYP grades only, which are grades 3 through 8 and 10. Results in 1.6.3.2.1 include KG, 1, 2, 9, 11, and 12 grades additionally.	

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	8,840	45.6
ELP attainment	590	35.9
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
385	205	590
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
411	362	88.1	49
Comments:			

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

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

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
409	374	91.4	35
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
186	151	81.2	35
Comments:			

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	244
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	104
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	167
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	133
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	228
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	9
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	76
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: The number of Ohio Title III subgrantees as reported above is significantly larger than the number reported in the 2006-2007 CSPR. The reason for the difference is that for 2006-2007, Ohio counted each consortium as a grantee (compiling data from district members) per the guidelines we received from USDE. However, for 2007-2008, Ohio is counting each district member of a consortium as a grantee for accountability purposes, per the option allowed in the recently-published USDE Title III Interpretations.	

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
11,309	7,438	33

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.	1,458
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	780

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	173	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	149	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	104	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	49	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	95	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	181	8,056
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	162	1,169
PD provided to principals	149	853
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	151	462
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	132	1,075
PD provided to community based organization personnel	95	589
Total		12,204

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other content addressed in professional development activities include the following:

- Differentiation of Assessment and Instruction
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Training (12) and Survival Spanish (6)
- Supporting Understanding of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students Series:

Topics Include-Second Language Acquisition/Bilingualism, Assessment/Evaluation, Determining Language Difference from Language Disorder, Classroom Support/Interventions/Therapy

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	07/15/07	14
Comments:		

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

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Ohio SEA can shorten the process of distributing funds to subgrantees by continuing to provide ongoing technical assistance so that grantees submit their Consolidated Application (all programs funded under Title III) by July 1 of the new fiscal year. When an Ohio subgrantee submits a Consolidated Application as superintendent approved to the Ohio SEA through an online allocation and application process, it is considered to be substantially approved, and as of that date legal obligations can be incurred for as long as the budget meets the requirements for use of funds. Cash disbursements to subgrantees become available within two weeks after the Consolidated Application is reviewed by the SEA consultant and approved by the Executive Director.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	79.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	71.3
Hispanic	67.0
White, non-Hispanic	90.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	84.6
Limited English proficient	74.2
Economically disadvantaged	74.5
Migratory students	64.9
Male	85.5
Female	88.4
Comments: Multiracial = 77.2%	

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.

Ohio has a data collection system that allows tracking of individual students over time. Efforts are underway in two areas. 1) Data quality - Work is proceeding to assure that data being submitted are consistent with the business rules that assign students for accountability purposes. 2) Policy and state legislative adjustments - Plans are being made to assure that state law and rules are consistent with federal reporting requirements.

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	4.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.9
Black, non-Hispanic	9.1
Hispanic	17.4
White, non-Hispanic	2.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.4
Limited English proficient	6.6
Economically disadvantaged	7.5
Migratory students	17.5
Male	4.6
Female	3.8
Comments: Multiracial = 6.9%	

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	1,078	1,078
LEAs with subgrants	20	20
Total	1,098	1,098
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)	0	406
K	382	925
1	413	944
2	347	913
3	325	881
4	320	900
5	274	779
6	274	740
7	264	870
8	232	824
9	267	1,237
10	185	706
11	176	557
12	167	515
Ungraded	0	97
Total	3,626	11,294
Comments: For LEAs Without Subgrants, Age/Grade totals include some students whose Primary Nighttime Residence was not determined or did not fit easily into any of the four categories allowed.		

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	356	5,288
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,682	5,363
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	50	320
Hotels/Motels	235	323
Total	3,323	11,294
Comments: For LEAs Without Subgrants, Age/Grade totals in 1.9.1.1 include some students whose Primary Nighttime Residence was not determined or did not fit easily into any of the four categories allowed here.		

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)	788
K	959
1	902
2	853
3	807
4	839
5	704
6	728
7	773
8	755
9	1,178
10	646
11	527
12	452
Ungraded	113
Total	11,024
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	578
Migratory children/youth	30
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,466
Limited English proficient students	200
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	20
Expedited evaluations	12
Staff professional development and awareness	18
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	18
Transportation	19
Early childhood programs	17
Assistance with participation in school programs	17
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	18
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	18
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	19
Counseling	13
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	15
Clothing to meet a school requirement	15
School supplies	20
Referral to other programs and services	19
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	12
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 services include literacy events and food backpacks for doubled-up students.

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	8
School Selection	10
Transportation	14
School records	8
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	6
Other Barriers – in comment box below	6

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other barriers include lack of public awareness of available services.

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	738	358
4	724	354
5	675	258
6	630	234
7	688	297
8	652	312
High School	1,107	601
Comments:		

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	688	315
4	724	283
5	671	182
6	638	231
7	687	208
8	662	228
High School	1,139	550
Comments:		

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)	394
K	174
1	172
2	136
3	150
4	128
5	116
6	121
7	110
8	104
9	100
10	101
11	74
12	36
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	916
Total	2,837
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 decreased 12% from the previous year. We have continued to experience this downward slope since 2003. This trend is attributed to a decline in migrant families with school-age children returning to Ohio, and a rise in adult single male workers who do not qualify for the migrant education programs. Another variable is farmers who elect to grow more traditional crops like corn and soy beans over crops that require contracting migrant workers, which is causing many migrant camps to close down permanently.

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)	167
K	112
1	108
2	83
3	96
4	77
5	58
6	72
7	49
8	36
9	30
10	30
11	19
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	241
Total	1,183
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.

The increase in the Category 2 count from last year to this year is 0.4 percent.

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 2007-2008 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count were generated using the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2). OMSIS2 is a client/server management information system utilizing the FileMaker suite of hosted database tools. OMSIS2 is developed and maintained by TRECA, a non-profit entity providing K-12 educational technology services through a consortium of Ohio public school districts.

Ohio also participates in the NGS consortium. Unique student identifier numbers assigned to newly identified children are provided by NGS. This way, students identified in Ohio, or any other NGS consortium member state, can be assigned their unique NGS USID number within Ohio's database. All Ohio Migrant Education historical data can be correlated, based upon the USID number, with every NGS consortium member state, and the student's complete migratory history and credit accrual history can be collected and made available online. During the Category 1 and Category 2 counts, NGS is sometimes used as a reference source.

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.

On the Certificate of Eligibility (COE), the following information is gathered:

-SECTION I Parent Data & Residence -parent's/ guardian's name, race, home language, Ohio current address, home base address and home base school district

-SECTION II Student Data -children's name, sex, birth date, birthplace, grade level, and USID number, date arrived in Ohio, and date arrived in school district

-SECTION III Eligibility Data -former address, new address, QAD, reason for moving, qualifying activity, and description/ type of agricultural work household members are engaged in

-SECTION IV Comments -eligibility/educational

All LEA programs are required to fill out attendance forms and transfer documents on every eligible child that is served for their summer and fall programs. This information has the days enrolled and present, as well as all education information, which includes reading skills, math skills and English level proficiency. Secondary credit information forms are also required for all 7th through 12th graders. This information includes classes and credit hours that the student participated in. After these forms are completed, the records coordinator and data entry specialist check to make sure that the forms are completed and the information is entered into OMSIS2.

Eligibility data, specifically Residency Date, QAD, Qualifying Activity, and PMOL are secured by the recruiters at the time of face-to-face interview and recorded on a COE. The COE is then sent by the Local Education Agency to the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC). Quality control procedures are conducted at OMEC to ensure the completion and correctness of the written eligibility information before data entry. Teachers provide our Records Clerk with student enrollment and participation data for our on-site and in-home summer-term programs. This information is then submitted to OMEC for data entry and record storage.

Recruiters are responsible for the completion of the Certificate of Eligibility through a personal interview with the child's family. This data is collected generally beginning in May and ending in November for Ohio's seasonal qualifying work, i.e., a variety of vegetables, fruits, processing plants, greenhouses, etc. Summer programs are held during the period of time between when a district ends school in the spring and when it starts school in the fall. This varies slightly from district to district. These programs usually run from June to August. Our year-round and fall programs are held in districts during the school year as appropriate for their migrant populations.

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.

OMEC enters data into OMSIS2 from the original COE documents, Comprehensive Needs Assessment forms, advocacy forms, verification forms, transfer documents and secondary credit forms, at the State Ohio Migrant Education Center. COEs first go through an extensive quality control in which the Identification and Recruitment coordinator signs stating that the COE is complete and accurate. The OMSIS2 interface provides fault tolerance during multiple-user access, and also provides extensive error checking at the time of input. Student information is updated as soon as the transfer records and secondary credit information is received from the LEA programs. Every year verification forms are run for each district to make sure that the students current address, qualifying arrival date, parents' names, residency dates are accurate. If there are any changes, the data entry staff at the Ohio Migrant Education Center makes the corrections by going into the student edit table in OMSIS2 to ensure accuracy.

OMSIS2 incorporates a FileMaker Pro client interface and a backend database hosted using Filemaker Server. This not only affords programmatic record locking control, but also reduces the possibility of a simple clerical error causing major data loss. Some mass-update capabilities exist, including up to six siblings on a single COE update, for example. Multiple assessment records can also be simultaneously entered for a child, and a number of time saving queries, designed specifically around the data entry methods in use at OMEC, are built into OMSIS2 to enhance OMEC's productivity by allowing for point-and-click field population.

When students are identified in Ohio for the first time, OMEC staff first checks the NGS system to see if they have been identified elsewhere. If they have, then Ohio uses the student's existing USID number, as shown in the NGS system. This check of the NGS system is accomplished using the worldwide web and NGS' password-protected system. A USID number is created on the NGS system if no

number exists for a given student. If NGS has a number, that number is used. In all cases the number either in or assigned for students through the NGS system is the only number used in Ohio's database for students. When eligible students are first identified and entered into the database, they are all Category I students. They are not counted in Category II unless they also are eligible for and receive funded summer services.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count only differs from the Category 1 count by which backend database tables are required to produce accurate and complete numbers. The Category 2 count references additional tables.

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.

A query is run against the database described above for category I students. It identifies those students between ages 3 and 21 (as shown by the Student Identification Table), that have made a qualifying move within the past 36 months (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table), and have had a third birthday before the end date of the program in which they participated (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table, the Student Identification Table and the Supplemental Program Information Table) or before the end of their residency in Ohio (we may reference an older sibling's enrollment information to determine this third criterion). Another query is run for the Category II students that includes all of the above, but additionally has a summer service indicator. The fields used to run this particular query are SID.USID, SID. LastName, SID. FirstName, ED.USID, SID.DeceasedDate, SID.GraduationDate, SID.BirthDate, ED.LastQualifyingMove, ED.Enrollmentdate, ED.WithdrawalDate, ED.OhioArrivalDate, and several flag fields that serve to exclude specific instances, for example, children who turn 3 during the school year, but for whom no Ohio residency can be guaranteed except at the age of two. The database administrator, or the administrator's representative, at the Ohio Migrant Education Center, executes these queries and updates a series of flags in a specific order. Each September a home visit is made to each student for whom a valid COE exists to determine if the student is still resident in the state. This verification date is added to our database. It will serve as an indication that the student is eligible to be included in category I for the new program year. All students added through a new COE during the program year are additionally counted, as previously described.

Summer program students are flagged in the student information table. A query is run against the data that lists all students served during the summer. These students are served in one or more of the following ways: district site-based summer programs, in-home instruction, ESL programs, and health fair participation. Recorded participation in a funding-eligible instructional service during the Summer/Intersession period is required and must be documented before an indicator can be updated in OMSIS2 that triggers the counting of a particular child. This is verified when the queries used in the child counts screen by the date of the services provided. If the date shown for the service does not fall during the designated summer period being counted, then it will not qualify a child to be counted. Each child counted always has at least one qualifying service for which has been documented a qualifying date. Services provided to children whose eligibility has just expired may be reported at the local level, but quality control procedures at the Ohio Migrant Education Center are in place to exclude these records from being entered into OMSIS2, or in a few cases entered with a 'N' in the funding flag field. Therefore, non-funded services provided to these children will not be inadvertently counted as funded.

Every student has a unique USID number that insures the child is only counted once. "New" students are checked out carefully in two different databases -the Ohio (OMSIS2) database and the Texas (NGS) database -to ensure that they have not already been assigned a different USID number. This is part of the quality control at the Ohio Migrant Education Center. Some of the quality-control criteria used to ensure the unique identity of a "new" child include: surname, parent/guardian first names, alternate spellings of surnames, migratory histories of families with similar names, and date of birth. If the child is determined to be a valid "new" child by these criteria, then the OMEC staff enters the child into the NGS database, which assigns the USID, and Ohio uses this USID as an aid to its primary identifier in OMSIS2 as well.

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.

The two counts are generated using the same system, except for the particular differences already mentioned in the preceding section.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following Ohio's Quality Control procedures are used to review and ensure the accuracy of written eligibility information. The Ohio Department of Education, Ohio Migrant Education Center, and local migrant education projects assure accuracy at their levels. A standard COE that conforms to Federal guidelines is used statewide in Ohio. Recruiters, directors, and clerks are trained on completion of the form at our annual recruitment conference. Quality control is assured at the local district level through a process that requires directors to review and sign each COE for students from their district. Once the COE flows to the Ohio Migrant Education Center, the state recruitment coordinator and the state records transfer coordinator again review the COE for correctness and completeness. The COE is entered into the database only after each of these people has approved it.

LEA recruiters, transfer record clerks, and project directors receive periodic updates on assistance, procedures and guidelines for Identification and Recruitment. An annual recruitment training is held each spring that provides an in-depth instruction on COE completion. Other meetings are called as needed. All recruiters receive a detailed handbook that provides them with eligibility criteria and COE completion guidance.

All state personnel are trained in interviewing migrant families and recording all eligibility data on a standard COE form. Recruiters and Clerks receive mandated extensive training and training manual in the completion of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) in following areas:

- a. The eligibility criteria
- b. Interview procedures
- c. Monitoring for accountability
- d. The role of the recruiter

The COE is the primary tool for collecting the data that certifies the children to qualify for migrant services. Once completed and checked for accuracy, information from the form is entered into the state database and becomes the basis for Category I identification. COE are checked for accuracy by LEA transfer record clerks, as well as project directors before it is turned into the Ohio Migrant Education Center by checking past verification forms for eligibility, student records and verifying birth dates on the NGS system. The identification and recruitment coordinator also signs that quality control is done on the COE before it is checked for complete accuracy and entered into the Ohio data base system. If a discrepancy occurs when it is received into the Records Office, the coordinator will then ask the identification and recruitment coordinator to contact the recruiter to revisit the family.

Recruiters and LEA transfer record clerks review COEs for accuracy and completeness. COE are then reviewed and co-signed by the project Directors before sending them to the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator at the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC), who checks forms for quality control. COE are then passed on for data entry and storage of information. COEs identified to have possible errors are returned to the district, and then to recruiters, for further explanation, documentation, and/or completion.

Recruiters resolve issues encountered on the COE forms by consulting the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the State Transfer Record Coordinator.

Ohio's MEP, State Director provides assistance to questions requiring interpretation of Federal/State laws, regulations or policies.

The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator periodically evaluates the effectiveness of quality control and revises procedures, if necessary, to assure effective systems operation. Information from the National Identification & Recruitment Conference and from sessions at the National Migrant Conference as well as pertinent memos and regulations are reviewed annually and used to update quality control as well as other identification and recruitment issues.

The final quality Control of all COEs is made at the Ohio Migrant Education Center. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and Records Coordinator review all data to ensure correctness of the written eligibility information. If there are any discrepancies on the student record, the LEA migrant staff will be contacted immediately. The recruiter will revisit the family to secure the proper legal information and return it to OMEC for final processing.

Once quality control procedures have been completed, as indicated above, the records transfer coordinator enters the record into the database. This is the final process in the COE data acquisition process. The Identification and Recruitment coordinator is responsible for a yearly review and update of quality control and COE completion procedures. These procedures are documented in our Identification and Recruitment Manual. Personnel are provided training at our annual spring recruitment conference on how to review summer site records, input data, and run reports.

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.

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.

Verification forms are printed annually and submitted to LEAs in the fall of each year to verify whether or not students are still here for the new program year Category I count. Directors verify demographic data accuracy and use these same lists. Lists are returned to OMEC for database update when completed. Individual files are pulled at random during the winter months to review for accuracy.

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.

A set of preparatory queries is run before the performance report queries are run. Preparatory queries are used to search each field for potentially bad data, such as a Grade Level of "P7" instead of "07" and anything that is the wrong length or outside of the normal range. If an incorrect value is found, the correct value is then entered into the Ohio Database System. One query uses Grade-Level as its criteria for dividing students in the chart, while another uses only birthdates. If the two counts of summer eligible disagree, then an error must exist in either a BirthDate field or a GradeLevel field. These two crosscheck queries will find a 3-yr-old who was reported as 2, or vice versa. This is typically the very last check before all of our final query numbers are generated.

Duplications are prevented through the use of a combination of Filemaker Pro database features, including extensive use of the "Go to Related Records" script command. Searches are initially performed in a related table, seeking funded services delivered during the current reporting period, and from there the "Go to Related Records" script is run, resulting in a found set of Students (not services). All counts for the performance report are then generated from the Students table, where each student has only one grade level and one unique identifier, to ensure no student can possibly be counted twice in any cell of any report table.

Category I Eligibility is first established for the majority of students using Filemaker Pro's "Constrain Foundset" feature repeatedly for each criteria that could possibly exclude a student from eligibility for the current reporting period. Students who certainly qualify based on this more rigorous screening are the first group marked as qualifying.

Students who also qualify, but whose eligibility for the current reporting period must be confirmed on a case-by-case basis, were excluded from this first group by the stringency of the initial queries. Instead, they are marked as qualifying one by one, only after their record is carefully reviewed to make sure, for example, that their age definitely qualified them to be counted as eligible for the reporting period.

After all Category I Eligibility has been marked, an export of data from the Student table into an empty Reporting table is executed. The reporting table contains many true-or-false fields, which correspond to each category of the annual performance report.

A database layout links the Student table to the Reporting table. By updating each of the Reporting table's true-or-false fields directly from within the Student table, and only after the Reporting table already contains exclusively Cat I Eligible records, it is possible to know with great certainty that A) only eligible students are contained in any individual count and B) there is absolutely no duplication.

Accuracy checks are finally performed, using the Reporting Table as a source and the Student table as the destination for a "Go to Related Records" script. For example, this technique could be used to find instantly the exact group of students reported as being in the Seventh Grade and also receiving Math instruction in the Summer. The group can be scrolled to verify that each student did in fact receive

Math instruction, and when and where, and is in fact a seventh grader.

The Reporting table is then preserved without changes, and directly within OMSIS2, every year. Over time this collection of annual tables serves as an ongoing Longitudinal Data (or Panel Data) reference tool for Management Information.

The State Migrant Education Director collects all data from the Queries listed in this document and reviews them for accuracy, reasonableness, and completeness. OMEC additionally provides the State Director with numbers from the previous years for Identification and Recruitment and services provided broken out by counties as identified and served. The director is thereby able to compare data from previous years as the state performance report is completed.

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.

None needed.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.
The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No concerns to report.

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