

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

PENNSYLVANIA



**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:
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Address:
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Erin Oberdorf

Telephone: 717-783-9161

Fax: 717-787-8634

e-mail: eoberdorf@state.pa.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Gerald L. Zahorchak

Friday, April 3, 2009, 9:45:49 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.

Pennsylvania refers to the Academic Content Standards as the Assessment Anchor Content Standards. No revisions or changes to the Assessment Anchor Content Standards taken or planned in Mathematics or Reading. The Assessment Anchor Content Standards for Science were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2008.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The only change to the State's assessment in Mathematics and Reading is to develop an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards. This alternate assessment will be administered for the first time in 2009-2010.

The only change to the state's academic achievement standards in Mathematics and Reading is to identify the modified academic achievement standards. The modified academic achievement standards will be identified in 2009-2010.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in Science not yet approved. The academic achievement standards in Science were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2008. Pennsylvania will be submitting Science for peer review in March 2009.
--

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	951,505	945,520	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,494	1,472	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	26,196	26,132	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	146,314	144,509	98.8
Hispanic	66,931	66,342	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	703,144	699,874	99.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	158,049	155,686	98.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,543	21,406	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	338,890	335,933	99.1
Migratory students	901	897	99.6
Male	488,329	484,877	99.3
Female	462,161	459,732	99.5
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	58,202	37.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	84,959	54.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	12,527	8.0

Total	155,688	
-------	---------	--

Comments: Alternate Assessment based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards and Modified Achievement Standards are not reported by PDE.

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	950,065	942,956	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,483	1,460	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,796	25,655	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	146,211	144,102	98.6
Hispanic	66,241	65,394	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	702,946	699,219	99.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	157,981	155,297	98.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,135	19,784	98.3
Economically disadvantaged students	337,981	334,325	98.9
Migratory students	868	863	99.4
Male	487,578	483,490	99.2
Female	461,480	458,566	99.4
Comments:			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	59,037	38.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	83,734	53.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	12,527	8.1
Total	155,298	
Comments: Alternate Assessment based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards and Modified Achievement Standards are not reported by PDE.		

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	412,110	404,681	98.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	687	668	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,007	10,895	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	60,788	57,881	95.2
Hispanic	26,926	26,142	97.1
White, non-Hispanic	309,195	305,813	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	66,647	64,939	97.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,984	7,822	98.0
Economically disadvantaged students	134,702	130,757	97.1
Migratory students	361	356	98.6
Male	210,645	206,740	98.1
Female	200,600	197,180	98.3
Comments: Includes students who were enrolled for full and not-full academic year.			

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	30,621	47.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,779	44.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,239	8.1
Total	64,639	
Comments: Alternate Assessment based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards and Modified Achievement Standards are not reported by PDE.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	130,280	103,773	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	157	75.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,833	3,412	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,673	12,143	58.7
Hispanic	10,221	6,178	60.4
White, non-Hispanic	94,065	81,017	86.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,203	11,420	53.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,234	2,042	48.2
Economically disadvantaged students	51,224	33,823	66.0
Migratory students	132	62	47.0
Male	67,110	53,666	80.0
Female	63,058	50,049	79.4
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	129,857	98,755	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	145	70.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,746	3,158	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,608	11,488	55.7
Hispanic	10,059	5,560	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	93,967	77,559	82.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,139	9,243	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,952	1,535	38.8
Economically disadvantaged students	50,956	31,131	61.1
Migratory students	124	52	41.9
Male	66,875	48,728	72.9
Female	62,871	49,968	79.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	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: Pennsylvania does not report Student Academic Achievement in Science for Grade 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.

1.3.1.2 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	129,883	102,272	78.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	143	73.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,868	3,487	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20,510	11,475	55.9
Hispanic	10,102	6,239	61.8
White, non-Hispanic	94,102	80,168	85.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,233	11,312	50.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,685	1,746	47.4
Economically disadvantaged students	50,276	32,630	64.9
Migratory students	141	66	46.8
Male	66,841	52,787	79.0
Female	62,963	49,443	78.5
Comments:			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	129,471	90,155	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	120	61.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,792	3,117	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,456	9,131	44.6
Hispanic	9,915	4,817	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	94,014	72,302	76.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,175	8,105	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,387	929	27.4
Economically disadvantaged students	50,023	26,023	52.0
Migratory students	135	46	34.1
Male	66,621	44,271	66.5
Female	62,772	45,844	73.0
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	129,476	104,800	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	157	75.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,833	3,345	87.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,265	11,293	55.7
Hispanic	10,011	5,883	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	93,894	83,223	88.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,036	13,300	60.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,617	1,497	41.4
Economically disadvantaged students	49,482	32,734	66.2
Migratory students	140	57	40.7
Male	66,497	53,806	80.9
Female	62,789	50,884	81.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	130,809	94,799	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	126	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,809	3,266	85.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,601	10,181	49.4
Hispanic	9,794	5,148	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	95,384	75,464	79.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,453	8,826	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,450	1,186	34.4
Economically disadvantaged students	49,370	27,858	56.4
Migratory students	142	54	38.0
Male	66,739	48,217	72.2
Female	63,960	46,539	72.8
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	130,442	79,499	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	110	61.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,729	2,731	73.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,554	7,465	36.3
Hispanic	9,661	3,565	36.9
White, non-Hispanic	95,294	65,130	68.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,407	5,700	25.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,185	496	15.6
Economically disadvantaged students	49,134	20,388	41.5
Migratory students	136	32	23.5
Male	66,543	38,720	58.2
Female	63,790	40,744	63.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	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: Pennsylvania does not report Student Academic Achievement in Science for Grade 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	134,395	96,377	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	132	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,756	3,258	86.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,755	10,017	48.3
Hispanic	9,691	4,891	50.5
White, non-Hispanic	99,014	77,523	78.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,610	7,985	35.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,965	990	33.4
Economically disadvantaged students	49,564	27,276	55.0
Migratory students	119	44	37.0
Male	69,267	49,661	71.7
Female	65,044	46,690	71.8
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.4 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	134,025	88,898	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	190	121	63.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,666	2,835	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,705	8,403	40.6
Hispanic	9,564	3,869	40.5
White, non-Hispanic	98,924	73,165	74.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,555	6,367	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,727	456	16.7
Economically disadvantaged students	49,336	23,190	47.0
Migratory students	117	31	26.5
Male	69,064	43,466	62.9
Female	64,877	45,414	70.0
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.4 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: Pennsylvania does not report on Student Academic Achievement in Science for Grade 6.			

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

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	139,344	97,343	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	128	56.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,717	3,235	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21,640	9,920	45.8
Hispanic	9,722	4,679	48.1
White, non-Hispanic	103,044	78,890	76.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,132	7,015	30.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,708	874	32.3
Economically disadvantaged students	50,168	26,293	52.4
Migratory students	143	57	39.9
Male	71,669	49,891	69.6
Female	67,495	47,406	70.2
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	138,980	96,390	69.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	127	56.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,652	3,045	83.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,581	10,230	47.4
Hispanic	9,591	4,572	47.7
White, non-Hispanic	102,952	77,923	75.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,072	6,378	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,484	544	21.9
Economically disadvantaged students	49,938	25,521	51.1
Migratory students	139	45	32.4
Male	71,458	45,917	64.3
Female	67,351	50,426	74.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Pennsylvania does not report on Student Academic Achievement in Science for Grade 7.			

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

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	142,449	99,070	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	149	62.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,694	3,200	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22,459	10,218	45.5
Hispanic	9,712	4,814	49.6
White, non-Hispanic	105,358	80,220	76.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,857	6,834	28.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,593	823	31.7
Economically disadvantaged students	49,575	25,930	52.3
Migratory students	121	42	34.7
Male	73,378	50,330	68.6
Female	68,907	48,687	70.7
Comments:			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	142,039	110,006	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	168	70.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,638	3,156	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22,352	12,568	56.2
Hispanic	9,582	5,395	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	105,251	88,139	83.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,778	8,724	36.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,380	683	28.7
Economically disadvantaged students	49,303	30,097	61.0
Migratory students	114	44	38.6
Male	73,174	53,980	73.8
Female	68,699	55,957	81.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	141,237	73,928	52.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	250	115	46.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,675	2,381	64.8
Black, non-Hispanic	21,821	4,308	19.7
Hispanic	9,540	2,273	23.8
White, non-Hispanic	104,824	64,526	61.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,427	4,579	19.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,539	223	8.8
Economically disadvantaged students	48,364	14,348	29.7
Migratory students	130	23	17.7
Male	72,703	38,819	53.4
Female	68,265	35,065	51.4
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

	# 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	138,362	76,601	55.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	224	99	44.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,455	2,656	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17,872	4,859	27.2
Hispanic	7,101	2,148	30.2
White, non-Hispanic	108,907	66,612	61.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,200	3,226	16.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,771	423	23.9
Economically disadvantaged students	35,758	12,419	34.7
Migratory students	99	21	21.2
Male	69,875	39,210	56.1
Female	68,305	37,357	54.7
Comments:			

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

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

	# 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	138,143	88,692	64.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	225	120	53.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,432	2,396	69.8
Black, non-Hispanic	17,847	6,383	35.8
Hispanic	7,022	2,598	37.0
White, non-Hispanic	108,817	76,871	70.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,172	4,292	21.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,669	188	11.3
Economically disadvantaged students	35,636	15,089	42.3
Migratory students	98	16	16.3
Male	69,756	42,011	60.2
Female	68,206	46,625	68.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
High School			
All students	133,968	47,448	35.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	55	26.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,387	1,544	45.6
Black, non-Hispanic	15,795	1,335	8.5
Hispanic	6,591	836	12.7
White, non-Hispanic	107,095	43,528	40.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,176	1,885	9.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,666	72	4.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,911	5,426	16.5
Migratory students	86	N<10	
Male	67,540	25,984	38.5
Female	66,126	21,427	32.4
Comments:			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	3,103	2,233	72.0
Districts	500	462	92.4
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,842	1,301	70.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	647	315	48.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,195	986	82.5
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
497	459	92.4
Comments: After post-appeal Erie City SD changed its status to made AYP.		

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))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: Pennsylvania does not have this information available at this time. It will be ready when the CSPR is reopened.	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: Pennsylvania does not have this information available at this time. It will be ready when the CSPR is reopened.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective 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.

PA's model is based on three tiers: Foundation Assistance, Field-Based Assistance and Targeted Assistance. A series of tools, resources, supports and programs have been developed by PDE and its partners to assist schools and districts in making decisions and research-proven changes in the educational environment to positively impact student achievement. The Bureau of Teaching & Learning Support has contracted with Delaware County IU 25 to serve as the lead in coordinating services offered by all partners, school improvement planning statewide and development and delivery of training statewide. The School Improvement Leadership Team serves to inform the policy makers in the PDE and to provide a comprehensive leadership approach to school improvement planning and implementation. The members of the team include representatives from many different educational arenas including IU Executive Directors, Superintendents, PaTTAN, professional associations, special education representatives, Delaware County IU 25 and PDE representatives. The leadership team meets regularly to discuss important school improvement issues, research-proven approaches, current issues in education and NCLB. The School Improvement Core Team is a group of PDE and Delaware County IU 25 staff who review issues brought up by the SI Leadership Team, determine if changes need to be made to policies and procedures, and provide overall management of the SSOS. Programs, initiatives and tools provided and available at the Foundation Assistance level:

- Getting Results! Framework for School Improvement Planning: Template used by schools to develop school improvement plans.
- School Improvement Plan Review and Continuous Improvement: Support from IUs and PDE during the development of the plans.
- Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS): A measure of growth/ progress intended to serve as a complement to existing achievement measures.
- Voluntary Model Curriculum: A differentiated approach to instructional design for the needs of a diverse student population.
- Assessment Anchors: Focus on a set of core standards that can be measured by a large-scale assessment.
- Adopt-an Anchor Program: Design and implement a "reading and mathematics across the curriculum" at the secondary level targeted to the assessment anchors.
- Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership Program (PIL): Statewide, standards-based leadership development and support system for school leaders at all levels.
- Project 720 (High School Reform Model): State grant to promote high schools that are student-centered, data-informed and personalized in the delivery of services to students.
- Classrooms for the Future: Funding for technology equipment, infrastructure, and support to foster 21st Century teaching and learning.
- Dual Enrollment: College courses and postsecondary credit while completing high school graduation requirements.
- Early College, Middle College and Gateway to College Programs: Support at-risk students who are not succeeding in their traditional high school environments and help them to finish high school and enter college.
- Accountability Block Grant (ABG): Effective educational practices and initiatives to improve student achievement in the core subject areas of math, literacy and science.
- Academy for Urban Teaching: Challenging minority youth in urban inner-city schools to consider teaching as a profession.
- College and Career Counseling Grants: Student-centered 8-12 career development system for preparing high school graduates for college and career success.
Below is a summary of the different professional development opportunities available to all schools within the Foundation Assistance tier of

PA's SSOSS:

- Getting Results! Professional Development
- Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS) Training Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership (PIL) Professional Development:
- 4 Sight Benchmark Assessment Training
- Center for Data Driven Reform in Education (CDDRE)
- Response to Intervention State Alignment & Support
- PA Governor's Institutes
- Online Professional Development
- PDE Professional Development & Support
- PaTTAN Professional Development: Three regional locations (Pittsburgh, Harrisburg and King of Prussia) provide ongoing training for parents and educators. The Field-Based Assistance (Tier 2) level of supports provides more targeted, focused support to schools identified as School Improvement I or School Improvement II.
- Education Assistance Program (EAP): Requires school districts identified for improvement or higher to develop and implement tutoring programs for students failing to score at or above the proficient level on the PSSA
- IU Capacity Building Support—Field-Based Assistance (Level 2): State funds are provided to LEAs for their schools identified for improvement or corrective action (\$9500 per building).
- Title I School Improvement Funding: Title I SI set aside funds are made available to all Title I buildings identified for School Improvement I or II. All schools in these levels of improvement received a "Base" allocation of \$40,000 to support the activities outlined within each schools' approved school improvement plans.
- Required Attendance at Model 1 Governor's Institutes: School districts with one or more schools in school improvement or higher are required to send school-based teams of educators to the Data Driven Decision Making Governor's Institute facilitated by CDDRE staff, distinguished educators, EAP Technical Assistants, PDE and IU curriculum and special education advisors.
- Bureau of Teaching & Learning Supports: When schools are identified for improvement, the Division of Federal Programs provides assistance in the development of school improvement plans, parent notification letters and budgets for required federal fund set asides. In addition, the Division of Continuous School and District Improvement provides technical assistance regarding plan development and timelines for plan development, submission and implementation. At the top of the three-tiered model, the assistance to schools and districts is the most personalized and intensive. High levels of corrective action receive more customized, directed assistance from SSOS partners.
- Distinguished Educator Initiative (DE): The PDE has developed the DE program to recruit, train and assign experienced educators to struggling schools and districts in planning and implementing effective school reform efforts. Depending on the needs of the areas to which they are assigned, DEs may serve as coaches or mentors for administrators, assist in the development of prescriptive solutions to student achievement problems and provide budget and financial assistance. DEs are assigned for a minimum of a year and work one-on-one with school personnel as an integral participant in reform efforts.
- Distinguished School Leaders Program (DSL): The DSL program provides schools with experienced special educators to work directly with them if their IEP subgroup is the focus of school improvement efforts. These DSLs work out of the regional PaTTAN offices and are available to their assigned schools at any time. They work along side of the DEs so that reform efforts are coordinated and complimentary.
- IU Capacity Building Support—Targeted Assistance (Level 3): In addition to Levels I and II supports to schools, schools in

corrective action are awarded \$10,000 in state funding through the schools' local IU. The IU staff, DE, DSL and school administration must plan and coordinate the use of these funds.

- Title I School Improvement Funds: Schools in CA also receive "Targeted" funds of \$58,000. Schools in Restructuring with highest need receive an additional \$50,000. Total amount of funds available to schools at the highest levels of CA exceeds \$140,000.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

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	21	1
Schools	75	15
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	07/31/08
---	----------

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	155,071	154,116
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	48,242	42,057
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	31.1	27.3
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	45,957	40,463
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	29.6	26.3
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	91	
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	49
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	220
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.
Comments: PA Department of Education did not collect this data in this manner. It will be corrected in future years.						

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One key component is the restructuring of our Department website to provide information for teachers and administrators that targets specific strategies for the classroom. These include videos of international educational research experts discussing and modeling research based practices, peer modeling and practices, tutorials on specific strategies.

Additionally, there has been extensive work on a voluntary model curriculum that aligns standards, anchors, curriculum and even provides exemplar lesson plans to support teachers in implementing research-based strategies.

Through our statewide partners in the Intermediate Units, we provide professional development and training on all of the essential components for school and district improvement . Ongoing training and hands on support occurs weekly through not only our Intermediate Unit partners, but also the PATTAN (training network) across the Commonwealth. The Department also provides statewide training and professional development targeting administrators through our PA Inspired Leadership program (patterned after the National Institute School Leadership -NISL) as well as Governor's Institutes for school improvement and data-driven instruction.

These are just a few of the ways that this information is shared on a continuous basis.

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.

Using funds reserved from Section 1003(g)(8), the Pennsylvania Department of Education has done the following:

Pennsylvania provides evaluative data for all schools identified for improvement using several different methods. The first is the online PSSA school and district report cards. These report cards provide each school and district with evaluative information regarding their students performance on the PSSA. Secondary evaluative information is provided to each school and district through the use of the state's Performance Index and PVAAS (PA's Growth Model). Finally, each school and district is given reports from eMetrix. All of these data reports are then used to assist schools in determining root cause, finding solutions and implementing a comprehensive school improvement plan. Technical assistance to schools and districts begins when all of these data sources are available. Each Intermediate Unit in PA serves as a support center for the schools and districts within their service area. IUs provide support for data analysis, training to determine root cause, and expertise in carrying out improvement strategies. Funds are used to support the statewide network of IU support as well as to provide conferences on data driven decision-making and regional workshops throughout the year on plan implementation. Finally, funds are used to provide schools in improvement with distinguished educators, leadership training and curriculum frameworks and resources necessary for improvement.

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

1.4.8.6 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.

Section 1003(g) funds and several other federal grants are used to supplement many of the state-funded supports to schools and districts in improvement. State funds are used to provide capacity building funds to each IU in order to support schools in improvement, distinguished educators, distinguished school leaders, leadership training, curriculum frameworks, school improvement toolkits and plan frameworks, regional trainings and statewide conferences in support of improvement.

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

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	141,556
Applied to transfer	734
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	433

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	No
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	\$ 67,174
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 school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³

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/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	74,907
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,557
Received supplemental educational services	2,481
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	\$ 2,796,630
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	360,669	348,088	96.5	12,581	3.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	14,343	13,872	96.7	471	3.3
Low-poverty schools	15,867	15,791	99.5	76	0.5
All elementary schools	62,469	61,375	98.2	1,094	1.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	44,304	39,542	89.3	4,762	10.7
Low-poverty schools	109,565	107,314	97.9	2,251	2.1
All secondary schools	298,200	286,713	96.1	11,487	3.9
Comments:					

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

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

Yes

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

LEAs submitted 2007-2008 HQT data elements into PA's new data management system. As a result of converting to a new data system, the PA Department of Education is able to report HQT/NHQT percentages at the classroom level for the first time in the 2007-2008 Consolidated State Performance Report. Prior to the submission of the 2007-2008 HQT data elements, PA's data system was limited to calculating HQT/NHQT percentages based on the top three teaching assignments submitted by each LEA. There are significant increases to (1) the total number of classes reported and (2) the total number of secondary classes in PA's 2007-2008 CSPR.

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.

Currently PA counts full-day self-contained elementary classes as one class.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	71.5
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs submitted 2007-2008 HQT data elements into PA's new data management system. As a result of converting to a new data system, the PA Department of Education is able to report HQT/NHQT percentages at the classroom level for the first time in the 2007-2008 Consolidated State Performance Report. Prior to the submission of the 2007-2008 HQT data elements, PA's data system was limited to calculating HQT/NHQT percentages based on the top three teaching assignments submitted by each LEA. There are significant increases to (1) the total number of classes reported and (2) the total number of secondary classes in PA's 2007-2008 CSPR. The percentage of elementary school classes in the "other" category above represent educators who are teaching outside of their certificate (out-of-field).

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)	51.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	26.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	22.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs submitted 2007-2008 HQT data elements into PA's new data management system. As a result of converting to a new data system, the PA Department of Education is able to report HQT/NHQT percentages at the classroom level for the first time in the 2007-2008 Consolidated State Performance Report. Prior to the submission of the 2007-2008 HQT data elements, PA's data system was limited to calculating HQT/NHQT percentages based on the top three teaching assignments submitted by each LEA. There are significant increases to (1) the total number of classes reported and (2) the total number of secondary classes in PA's 2007-2008 CSPR.

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	51.2	16.1
Poverty metric used	For each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the POVERTY CODE field in the Student Snapshot template (# poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for elementary schools. Quartiles are numbered 1 through 4, with Quartile 1 being the "High Poverty" schools and Quartile 4 the "Low Poverty" schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	
Secondary schools	51.5	16.2
Poverty metric used	For each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the POVERTY CODE field in the Student Snapshot template (# poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for secondary schools. Quartiles are numbered 1 through 4, with Quartile 1 being the "High Poverty" schools and Quartile 4 the "Low Poverty" schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish/Chinese (Mandarin)
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
No	Transitional bilingual	
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other programs include: Staff development, adult literacy program, ESL summer school, push-in ESL, professional development, extended day program, before & after school tutoring program, RTI, co-teaching, content area tutoring, summer enrichment and technology, content area 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	46,793
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.	38,981
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	26,489
Vietnamese	1,474
Chinese	1,346
Russian	1,123
Arabic	1,089

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	46,171
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	622
Total	46,793
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	10,164
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	21.7
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	38,926
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	55
Total	38,981
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.

1.6.3.2.2 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		
ELP attainment	8,565	
Comments: PA is experiencing significant data quality issues. PA cannot provide this information at this time. PA is working to remedy data discrepancies and will provide the data as soon as the discrepancy has been rectified.		

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
1,951	470	2,421
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
Comments: PA is experiencing significant data quality issues. PA cannot provide this information at this time. PA is working to remedy data discrepancies and will provide the data as soon as the discrepancy has been rectified.			

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
Comments: PA is experiencing significant data quality issues. PA cannot provide this information at this time. PA is working to remedy data discrepancies and will provide the data as soon as the discrepancy has been rectified.			

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
Comments: PA is experiencing significant data quality issues. PA cannot provide this information at this time. PA is working to remedy data discrepancies and will provide the data as soon as the discrepancy has been rectified.			

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	100
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	
Comments: Calculations are being performed by an outside contractor.	

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 Response</u>
Comments: Calculations are being performed by an outside contractor.	

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?	Yes
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	10
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
15,203	1,073	0

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.

No LEA received Immigrant funding that did not receive a Title III grant for LEP.

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.	7,745
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	654

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	83	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	71	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	62	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	55	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	49	
Other (Explain in comment box)	34	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	73	10,757
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	82	33,795
PD provided to principals	66	1,141
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	59	715
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	50	2,027
PD provided to community based organization personnel	27	409
Total	357	48,844

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development activities: Language Acquisition, instructional materials, cultural awareness, curriculum fair, TESOL, PA Department of Education Professional Development opportunities, immigration reform, training for bilingual interpreters in school settings, workshop for migrant education staff members and migrant education parents, and provided parent academy instruction in English as well as instruction on how to help your ELL child.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	07/24/08	24
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 delay between the allocation of funds and distribution to the subgrantees was due to issues with a new data collection. The subgrantees were required to submit this data so the Division of Federal Programs could determine proper allocations. This should not be an issue next year as the subgrantees will have experience at submitting this information.

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	12
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	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	83.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	80.0
Hispanic	73.2
White, non-Hispanic	92.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	83.2
Limited English proficient	72.2
Economically disadvantaged	81.5
Migratory students	73.5
Male	88.5
Female	91.3
Comments:	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The graduation rates are being calculated the same way as in past years. The new PIMS system began the collection of the 2006-2007 ninth graders who are for the cohort that will graduate in 2010. At that time the calculation will change to the NGA method.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2.9

Hispanic	4.0
White, non-Hispanic	1.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14.2
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	1.8
Male	1.7
Female	1.3
Comments: PA does not collect Limited English Proficient or Economically Disadvantaged dr	opout rates.

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	8	8
Comments: Pennsylvania covers all 501 LEAs as Pennsylvania now has a statewide homeless program. There are no LEAs without subgrants		

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)		1,247
K		903
1		1,002
2		975
3		972
4		840
5		779
6		793
7		770
8		733
9		806
10		672
11		516
12		748
Ungraded		0
Total		11,756

Comments: The number of homeless students served is higher than the number of homeless students enrolled due to the fact that there are homeless children and youth that are served through supplementary services provided by the shelters/agencies and/or the eight statewide PAHCI Regional Coordinator sites for which enrollment could not be confirmed. One example would be phone calls to the eight Regional sites for information, etc. Another example would be Salvation Army Shelters, YWCA Shelters, or a Catholic Charities Shelters, and other shelters that have our posters, booklets, parent packets, etc. about the Pennsylvania Homeless Children Initiative Program. Families that stay at these shelters have most likely been exposed to our services even though the children may not have been confirmed homeless through the school enrollment process or through the PSSA testing process. So the children are being served along with the doubled-up (shared housing), run-away and unaccompanied youth that may also have seen our information and are also being served. Pennsylvania did not capture all of the Primary Nighttime Residence data for the 2007-2008 CSPR for 1.9.1.2. due to some of the LEAs using a column that was titled "other". Pennsylvania will capture the Primary Nighttime Residence data for 2008-2009.

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		5,620
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		4,068
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		354
Hotels/Motels		497
Total		10,539

Comments: The number of homeless students served is higher than the number of homeless students enrolled due to the fact that there are homeless children and youth that are served through supplementary services provided by the shelters/agencies and/or the eight statewide PAHCI Regional Coordinator sites for which enrollment could not be confirmed. One example would be phone calls to the eight Regional sites for information, etc. Another example would be Salvation Army Shelters, YWCA Shelters, or a Catholic Charities Shelters, and other shelters that have our posters, booklets, parent packets, etc. about the Pennsylvania Homeless Children Initiative Program. Families that stay at these shelters have most likely been exposed to our services even though the children may not have been confirmed homeless through the school enrollment process or through the PSSA testing process. So the children are being served along with the doubled-up (shared housing), run-away and unaccompanied youth that may also have seen our information and are also being served. Pennsylvania did not capture all of the Primary Nighttime Residence data for the 2007-2008 CSPR for 1.9.1.2. due to some of the LEAs

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)	1,442
K	1,035
1	1,053
2	981
3	927
4	904
5	795
6	777
7	818
8	739
9	756
10	645
11	522
12	640
Ungraded	765
Total	12,799

Comments:

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	661
Migratory children/youth	144
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,529
Limited English proficient students	359
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	7
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	5
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Provided school supplies to shelters and districts. Emergency assistance not related to school attendance.

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	5
School Selection	7
Transportation	7
School records	6
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Many of the barriers to the education of homeless students have been reduced by the Regional Office structure which Pennsylvania currently utilizes. Additional barriers reported by the Regional Offices include:

- the variance between housing rules and definitions and the definitions used in education of homeless students
 - ensuring prompt and positive connections with the parents/families of homeless students, which is especially difficult when the families are reticent to share their homeless status
 - ensuring ongoing communication and coordination with private providers serving the homeless population
 - ensuring prompt access to all school records, especially special education records such as evaluations and IEP determinations

Due to staff turnover among the Regional Coordinators, knowledge and experience varies in obtaining and reporting data regarding the homeless student population. However, ongoing communication, education and support for the network of Coordinators will provide a

forum to ensure accurate and complete data reporting regarding this student population.

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	316	138
4	294	108
5	272	99
6	265	90
7	269	113
8	244	125
High School	194	84
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	311	142
4	298	150
5	272	122
6	266	117
7	271	103
8	243	104
High School	200	77
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	826
K	324
1	359
2	357
3	308
4	318
5	282
6	279
7	275
8	267
9	295
10	264
11	190
12	133
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	1,624
Total	6,103
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education Migrant Education Program (PDE MEP) experienced a roughly 26% drop in Category 1 Count due to lower ID&R results deriving from various factors including changes in migratory patterns, immigration issues and tighter interpretation of MEP eligibility regulations.

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)	519
K	201
1	225
2	202
3	174
4	202
5	155
6	143
7	151
8	135
9	158
10	149
11	109
12	10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	411
Total	2,945
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.

PDE MEP experienced an approximately 22% drop in Category 2 Count due to having a smaller population available to serve as indicated in the explanation for the Category 1 Count.

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.

PDE MEP Category 1 and Category 2 counts were generated using MIS2000 in the same manner as has been done for many years and is anticipated for future years.

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.

Both counts were collected from the State MIS2000 Database. This is a consolidated database from the Five regional MIS2000 systems. This data is assimilated daily into the state database. The system collects a variety of demographic and MEP eligibility enrollment data to be used for generating the childcounts. The data is collected and examined throughout the year and after the data is run through all automatic and manual edit and error checks (including several final checks for unduplication), the final reports are run in late October and submitted to the CSPR via the EDEN X/N 121 and 122 files as well as manually entered on this report for verification.

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.

After going through a rigorous quality control process, COE's are entered into the MIS2000 system by trained data specialists who provide another level of quality control, especially checking for duplication of students. Reports are generated and reviewed by Student Support Specialists and Recruiters to make sure the students match their records. Verification is also performed to make sure that students recruited in previous years are still residing in the state. It is required that a Needs Assessment is completed annually on every student and this is a method of verifying that they are still here. If a child is found to not be here any longer, that enrollment is totally removed from the system, resulting in that child no longer being counted on the reports. Reports are run that uniquely count a child only once, and only in a single (highest) grade for reporting these counts. COE's are completed using face-to-face interviews by trained recruiters in accordance with the PA Dept of Education's Migrant Education Program Quality Control Manual. COE's are completed once upon initial recruitment or any time there is a new qualifying move. Recruiters or Student Support Specialists also annually complete a Needs Assessment on each child or youth as mentioned above as part of the annual verification that children or youth are still resident in the Commonwealth. These are also completed on a face-to-face basis. Recruiters, Student Support Specialists and Data Specialists are hired by our five Local Operation Agency subgrantees and all staff are required to attend four quarterly training sessions in their respective disciplines and our Annual State Conference as well as periodic webinars in order to maintain a consistent level of proficiency in skills aligned with current regulations and guidelines.

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.

This is the same as Category 1, except that students are only counted if they are marked as being enrolled in a MEP funded summer program. Strict guidelines have been issued as to what constitutes a summer service based on OME guidance and documentation that such service was provided using attendance lists or other methods documenting the service delivery are required for backup justification purposes. In addition, starting this year, more detailed tracking of the level of summer services has been added to the database.

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.

For over 12 years, PDE MEP has been using the same comprehensive high quality algorithm to count the students. In addition, many edit reports are created to verify that students who show on the count are truly eligible. For the 2007-08 count, the first thing the system checks is to make sure the Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) is on or after 9/1/04 and that Residency and QAD are before 8/31/08. ONLY students who meet all of the criteria of being a migrant student, including having a qualifying activity are included in the MIS2000 system. We also only count students who reached age 3 prior to 9/1/07 or if they reach age 3 between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08, they must still be residing in the state as of their third birthday. Reports are run on a regular basis and staff assigned to serve the children must verify that they are still resident. In addition, a Needs Assessment is required to be completed every year, and the child/youth must actually be encountered to complete this form. If a child turns age 22 prior 9/1/07 or before they are residing and enrolled in PA, they are excluded. If a child became a PA resident after 8/31/08 or left residency before 9/1/07 they are not counted. The general logic system of the reporting mechanism is designed to only count a student once per each child count category by assigning a single calculated grade per student and performing a distinct count by student.

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.

Same As Category 1, except only counting those enrolled as receiving a summer service as documented using our new Service Delivery Tracking. This was also compared to the enrollment as being indicated as a summer enrollment with a 100% match. The summer enrollment must also have started prior to reaching three years past their qualifying move or before reaching age 22 or before graduating or receiving a GED. Even if a student meeting any of these criteria is accidentally entered into the system as receiving a summer enrollment, the system would exclude them anyhow from the count. For students who turns age 3 between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08, the delivery of summer service must be after turning age 3 to count on the Category 2 report.

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.

PDE MEP has developed an extensive ID&R quality control process. Only those students recruited using this process including extensive verification and review are ever entered into the data system. Tests are run to make sure that family made a move within the past 36 months across school district lines where the move was the result of the intent to seek or obtain qualifying seasonal or temporary agricultural or fishing work that plays an important role in providing a living to the family, that any child has not reached age 22 or completed high school or equivalency. A series of questions and documentation of the results are recorded. This may include copies of pay stubs and contact with schools to verify the move in addition to the standard Certificate of Eligibility. If a student is ever later determined to be ineligible, they are completely removed from the system and will not be counted on any 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.

PDE MEP did not conduct a formal re-interview process during 2007-08 and is waiting on formal guidance from OME before completing one in 2008-09. However despite that, our quality control process reviews 100% of the COE's as mentioned in the previous question. In addition, 20% of the COEs are re-verified by a state recruitment coordinator or auditor. In the past year absolutely none of those audited were found to be not eligible. All questionable cases were determined ineligible during initial Quality Control and never reached MIS2000. Between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08 1324 COE's with 2043 unique students were completed and passed Quality Control and 20% were randomly selected by the MIS2000 system on a monthly basis (approximately 265 COEs annually) for state auditing. Of those audited, NONE were determined to be ineligible.

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.

Recruitment verification is monitored throughout the entire year. In addition, reports are generated throughout the year for support staff to compare that the children in the database are indeed those who they are serving/are resident. A state monitoring team annually visits field offices and makes random verification of eligibility as well. If at any time a student is determined not to be eligible, they are simply and totally deleted from the regional database, which in turn is deleted from the state database system. Regional and State staff also monitor summer programs via several methods, including attendance rosters and portfolio summary sheets. Written guidelines based on OME guidance are distributed to staff dealing with summer enrollments. These were reviewed at trainings and/or meetings held for staff involved (e.g. Project Managers, Summer Teachers, Data Specialists). Lists are generated throughout the year and sent to the student support specialists who see the children on a regular basis. Any discrepancies between the lists and students actually enrolled in the program are noted and returned to the Data Specialist to make changes in the data system. Any changes made to the local database automatically propagate to the state database system. Periodically reports are run at the state and regional level and compared. If there are any discrepancies they are researched and corrected. State Office staff provide an annual monitoring audit to all project areas. COE's and student records are randomly audited as part of this monitoring process. In addition, this year we added a new process of recording specific summer services in the database. All students shown as having a summer enrollment were verified as having a documented summer service using this method as well. Throughout the enrollment process, trained Data Specialists ensure that students are not duplicated in the system at the regional or statewide level. If two enrolled students are determined to be the same student, they are merged into one single student. Reports are run periodically and especially immediately prior to the reporting of Category 1 and Category 2 counts that looks at students who have similar names and BirthDates and then manually compared to see if they are in fact the same student. This is done regionally and statewide as well and if students are found to be the same, they are merged into one single student.

and as such only counted once on the final Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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.

State staff thoroughly review all edit reports and compare Category 1 and 2 reports run from the state database with those run at the regional level. Any discrepancies are researched and resolved. On a monthly basis, trial numbers are shared with Regional Project Managers in comparison to previous year counts taking into account known factors such as changes in recruitment results and changes in

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.

There have been no indications of any major problems since the adoption of the new quality control process. When minor/borderline cases are encountered, they are addressed with the individual recruiter and also shared with all five regional recruitment staff and all recruiters who meet quarterly for training.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The PDE MEP has no concerns in reference to the accuracy of the non-duplicated Category 1 or Category 2 child counts we have presented or the eligibility of the students thus counted and reported. The presented numbers are complete and accurate to the best of our ability and our stringent quality recruitment and data controls and procedures.

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