

# **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 2008-09**

**DELAWARE**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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

Address:  
401 Federal St.  
Dover, DE 19901

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeff Fleming

Telephone: 302-735-4140

Fax: 302-739-4221

e-mail: jfleming@doe.k12.de.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Lillian M. Lowery

Friday, March 12, 2010, 2:51:54 PM

Signature

Date

Certified with Approval of Dr. Lowery

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

### STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Delaware has joined the multi-state Common Core Standards Initiative sponsored by the National Governor's Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers. Participating states have agreed via Memorandum of Understanding to review the final version of Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics due to be released in January 2010 with the intent of adopting the standards as approximately 85% of the state's revised academic content standards in these two areas (ELA, Mathematics). The Delaware Department of Education has submitted a draft plan and timeline for review and adoption of these standards to the Secretary of Education and Governor Jack Markell. The timeline calls for adoption of these standards by June 2010.

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 Delaware Department of Education is currently preparing for the final administration of the Delaware Student Testing Program Summative assessment given for mathematics and reading for grades 2-10 in March of 2010.

Starting in School year 2011, the state will be moving to an online assessment system named Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System. This new assessment system will be divided into three components for assessments in the content areas of reading and mathematics. These components are described below:

1. Benchmarking online assessment for Grade 2-10. This assessment will be given in grades 2-10 for reading and mathematics. These tests will be administered 1 to 3 times a year, with the first test being given within the first 30 days of the start of the school year.
2. Summative online assessment -Grades 3 -8. The assessment will be given in grades 2-10 for reading and mathematics. This assessment will be administered 1 to 3 times a year, with the best performance being used for Accountability and CSPR reporting. A paper and pencil assessment will be available for any students whose accommodations are not met in the online version.
3. End-of-course online summative assessment (high school) -This assessment will be given in reading and mathematics based on courses selected by the Delaware Department of Education. A student will be given up to 2 opportunities to take this summative assessment. The best performance will be used for accountability and CSPR reporting.

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 4,000 characters.

The Delaware Department of Education is currently preparing for the final administration of the Delaware Student Testing Program Summative assessment given for science in May 2010.

Starting in School year 2011, the state will be moving to an online assessment system named Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System. This new assessment system will be divided into two components for assessments in the content area of science. These components are described below:

1. Summative online assessment -Grades 5 and 8. The assessment will be given in grades 5 and 8 for science. This assessment will be administered 1 to 3 times a year, with the best performance being used for Accountability and CSPR reporting. A paper and pencil assessment will be available for any students whose accommodations are not met in the online version.
2. End-of-course online summative assessment (high school) -This assessment will be given in science based on courses selected by the Delaware Department of Education. A student will be given up to 2 opportunities to take this summative assessment. The best performance will be used for accountability and CSPR reporting.

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 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 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 ESEA. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.*

*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	66,077		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	219		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,144		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	22,330		>97%
Hispanic	7,049		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	34,335		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,471		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,141		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	29,004		>97%
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	33,906		>97%
Female	32,171		>97%
<b>Comments: These numbers are correct and are final.</b>			

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(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	744	7.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,917	84.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	729	7.8
Total	9,390	
<b>Comments: Number are correct and final</b>		

### 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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	65,836		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	217		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,105		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	22,270		>97%
Hispanic	6,936		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	34,308		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,459		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,941		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	28,867		>97%
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	33,784		>97%
Female	32,052		>97%
<b>Comments: This data is correct and final.</b>			

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

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

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's 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 (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	813	8.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,831	83.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	730	7.8
Total	9,374	
<b>Comments: Number are correct and final</b>		

#### 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 science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	36,635	36,362	>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	104	>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,227	1,220	>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	12,107	11,970	>97%
Hispanic	3,640	3,606	>97%
White, non-Hispanic	19,557	19,462	>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,276	5,175	>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,007	1,998	>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	14,666	14,556	>97%
Migratory students			
Male	18,657	18,504	>97%
Female	17,978	17,858	>97%
<b>Comments: This data is correct and final.</b>			

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

### 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 science assessment.

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

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,010	19.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,746	72.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	419	8.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	5,175	
<b>Comments: All data is updated and final.</b>		

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). 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.

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	9,588	7,465	77.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	27	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	343	311	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,273	2,078	63.5
Hispanic	1,188	861	72.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,745	4,188	88.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,170	572	48.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	939	673	71.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,682	3,189	68.1
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	4,955	3,866	78.0
Female	4,633	3,599	77.7
<b>Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	9,540	7,486	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	32	82.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	334	306	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,264	2,142	65.6
Hispanic	1,162	845	72.7
White, non-Hispanic	4,741	4,161	87.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,167	691	59.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	897	653	72.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,654	3,206	68.9
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	50.0
Male	4,926	3,682	74.8
Female	4,614	3,804	82.4

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: No students are currently tested in this grade in Delaware</b>			

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

### 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,458	7,205	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	18	85.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	315	283	89.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,158	1,947	61.7
Hispanic	1,135	764	67.3
White, non-Hispanic	4,829	4,193	86.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,385	609	44.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	865	553	63.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,469	2,921	65.4
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	4,904	3,703	75.5
Female	4,554	3,502	76.9

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,424	7,272	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	17	85.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	307	273	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,154	2,052	65.1
Hispanic	1,118	759	67.9
White, non-Hispanic	4,825	4,171	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,383	693	50.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	839	542	64.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4,452	2,950	66.3
Migratory students	N<15	1	50.0
Male	4,883	3,610	73.9
Female	4,541	3,662	80.6

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,479	8,627	91.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	24	92.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	320	301	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,162	2,653	83.9
Hispanic	1,134	970	85.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,837	4,679	96.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,351	981	72.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	860	716	83.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,229	3,612	85.4
Migratory students			
Male	4,910	4,440	90.4
Female	4,569	4,187	91.6

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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.

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,193	7,058	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	25	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	293	269	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,209	2,026	63.1
Hispanic	1,007	739	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	4,650	3,999	86.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,387	611	44.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	680	461	67.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,247	2,823	66.5
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	4,747	3,661	77.1
Female	4,446	3,397	76.4

**Comments: Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,147	7,409	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	22	64.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	284	259	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,196	2,233	69.9
Hispanic	987	740	75.0
White, non-Hispanic	4,646	4,155	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,384	743	53.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	645	448	69.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,222	3,034	71.9
Migratory students			
Male	4,720	3,722	78.9
Female	4,427	3,687	83.3

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: No students are currently tested in this grade in Delaware</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,229	6,867	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	29	23	79.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	316	292	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,091	1,838	59.5
Hispanic	943	627	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,850	4,087	84.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,463	534	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	551	312	56.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4,109	2,544	61.9
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	4,764	3,500	73.5
Female	4,465	3,367	75.4

**Comments: Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,200	7,116	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	29	27	93.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	313	291	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,082	2,040	66.2
Hispanic	929	630	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	4,847	4,128	85.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,462	612	41.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	528	305	57.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,094	2,698	65.9
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	4,750	3,447	72.6
Female	4,450	3,669	82.5

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals**

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**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,256	7,155	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	25	80.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	315	288	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,103	1,894	61.0
Hispanic	947	630	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,860	4,318	88.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,465	614	41.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	556	299	53.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,925	2,532	64.5
Migratory students			
Male	4,786	3,680	76.9
Female	4,470	3,475	77.7

**Comments: Black/Non-Hispanic -There was an identified decrease this year in proficiency for the population of students. Hispanic -There was an identified decrease this year in proficiency for the population of students. Limited English Proficient -There was an identified decrease this year in proficiency for the population of students. Economically disadvantages students -There was an identified decrease this year in proficiency for the population of students.**

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.

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,487	6,664	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	22	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	302	274	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,111	1,677	53.9
Hispanic	1,008	642	63.7
White, non-Hispanic	5,033	4,049	80.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,369	435	31.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	442	215	48.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4,122	2,323	56.4
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	66.7
Male	4,785	3,304	69.1
Female	4,702	3,360	71.5

**Comments: Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,446	7,835	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	27	81.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	291	275	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,101	2,268	73.1
Hispanic	992	787	79.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,029	4,478	89.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,364	628	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	411	275	66.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,099	3,034	74.0
Migratory students	N<15		>97%
Male	4,766	3,734	78.4
Female	4,680	4,101	87.6

**Comments: Limited English Proficient -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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**

	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: No students are currently tested in this grade in Delaware</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,915	6,502	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	17	70.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	291	261	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,489	1,628	46.7
Hispanic	991	592	59.7
White, non-Hispanic	5,120	4,004	78.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,512	470	31.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	392	159	40.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4,287	2,205	51.4
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	66.7
Male	5,099	3,372	66.1
Female	4,816	3,130	65.0

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,870	7,629	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	18	78.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	291	252	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,475	2,266	65.2
Hispanic	974	694	71.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,107	4,399	86.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,515	657	43.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	362	170	47.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,257	2,833	66.6
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	66.7
Male	5,083	3,756	73.9
Female	4,787	3,873	80.9

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,683	5,732	59.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	N<15	47.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	228	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,368	1,269	37.7
Hispanic	973	457	47.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,029	3,767	74.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,435	419	29.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	381	79	20.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,139	1,735	41.9
Migratory students			
Male	4,987	2,961	59.4
Female	4,696	2,771	59.0

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Children with Disabilities: This number is a large increase from last year, of 17%. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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.

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	8,919	5,035	56.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	22	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	282	224	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	2,833	980	34.6
Hispanic	748	346	46.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,019	3,463	69.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,104	248	22.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	263	73	27.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,935	1,158	39.5
Migratory students			
Male	4,466	2,583	57.8
Female	4,453	2,452	55.1

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	8,869	6,064	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	26	70.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	279	224	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,818	1,423	50.5
Hispanic	725	407	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	5,010	3,984	79.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,099	309	28.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	233	59	25.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,903	1,516	52.2
Migratory students			
Male	4,436	2,934	66.1
Female	4,433	3,130	70.6

**Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals.**

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**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	7,944	4,748	59.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	N<15	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	295	224	75.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2,337	893	38.2
Hispanic	552	258	46.7
White, non-Hispanic	4,736	3,361	71.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	924	246	26.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	201	48	23.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,263	946	41.8
Migratory students			
Male	3,821	2,325	60.9
Female	4,123	2,423	58.8
<b>Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native -There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Asian/Pacific Islander -The counts may change from year to year with student movement.</b>			

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

#### 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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	192	127	66.2
Districts	19	12	63.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	106	79	74.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	96	71	74.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	10	8	80.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
36	12	33.3
<b>Comments: Includes Some Charter Schools</b>		

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

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

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement <sup>1</sup> Year 1, School Improvement <sup>1</sup> Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	1
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	
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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	3
<b>Comments:</b>	

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2009-10 (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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

We are holding regional quarterly workshops for district staff members for districts in improvement and for districts with schools in improvement. Workshops are designed to help district level staff support their schools related to needs assessment, improvement planning, curricular and instructional alignment.

The DDOE has identified Distinguished Educators who serve as resources for both districts and schools in improvement. The DDOE is also in the process of developing learning communities where district staff members can collaborate across district lines to discuss research-based effective practices for both districts and schools in improvement.

#### 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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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 SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	33	13
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	07/24/09
---	----------

### 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 2008-09.

#### 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 2008-09.

*Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

*States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09		
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09		
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09		
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09		
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09		
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 2008-09		
<b>Comments:</b>		

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



assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

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

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

---

#### **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.

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**

##### **1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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: %

**Comments:**

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

#### **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 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

#### **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 2008-09 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.

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

#### 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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	3,559
Applied to transfer	66
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	66

##### 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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 102,950

##### 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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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	2

## 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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	1,868
Applied for supplemental educational services	374
Received supplemental educational services	374
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 104,946
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	20,066	18,717	93.3	1,349	6.7
All elementary classes	3,389	3,280	96.8	109	3.2
All secondary classes	16,677	15,437	92.6	1,240	7.4

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

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

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

## 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 is 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 the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

In the tables 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
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	30.3
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	11.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	57.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other reasons for elementary classes not being taught by a highly qualified teacher include the following.

(1) Certification issues, such as: certification mismatch with the class; not having the specialty certificate (special education, bilingual, ESOL, gifted and talented) required for the class; not holding full state certification.

(2) Teacher Quality Survey (Delaware's HQT data collection system) reasons, such as: Survey rejected by the district/charter school; unfinished Survey; teacher did not take the Survey; completed Survey but not verified by district/charter school staff.

	Percentage
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	44.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.6
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	33.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other reasons for secondary classes not being taught by a highly qualified teacher include the following.

(1) Certification issues such as: certification mismatch with the class; not having the specialty certificate (special education, bilingual, ESOL, gifted and talented) required for the class; not holding full state certification; expired certificate.

(2) Teacher Quality Survey (Delaware's HQT data collection system) reasons, such as: Survey rejected by the district/charter school; unfinished Survey; teacher did not take the Survey; completed Survey but not verified by district/charter school staff.

(3) Coding issues in the statewide pupil accounting system that is linked to the Survey, such as: no core academic subject specified; unique teacher identifier is missing.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

**NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).**

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	825	768	93.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	806	795	98.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,752	2,401	87.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	3,593	3,331	92.7

**1.5.4** In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	59.2	30.1
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced lunch participation.	
Secondary schools	49.2	23.5
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced lunch participation.	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(vii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- 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.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).**
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
No	Two-way immersion	NA
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	NA
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other ESL--Push-in

## 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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	6,646
Comments:	

### 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 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.	6,531
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; Castilian	4,830
Creoles and pidgins (Other)	258
Chinese	119
Gujarati	86
Arabic	73

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 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(a)(2).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the 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	6,484
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	397
Total	6,881
<b>Comments: Reasons for fewer students assessed may include one or more of these reasons: 1. Date total number of LEP students was entered into DELSIS is different from the total number when the ELP test, the ACCESS, was administered (spring). 2. Students left the state. 3. With the ACCESS, if students do not take all 4 parts of the test, they do not receive an overall composite proficiency level, so it would affect the total. 4. Students were absent during the administration of the test.</b>	

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,485
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	22.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,371
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	385
Total	6,756
<b>Comments: Reasons for fewer students assessed may include one or more of these reasons: 1. Date total number of LEP students was entered into DELSIS is different from the total number when the ELP test, the ACCESS, was administered (spring). 2. Students left the state. 3. With the ACCESS, if students do not take all 4 parts of the test, they do not receive an overall composite proficiency level, so it would affect the total. 4. Students were absent during the administration of the test.</b>	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	1,993

1.6.3.2.2

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	1,997	62.8	2,650	85.00
ELP attainment	923	29.0	3,802	85.00
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

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

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
Spanish
<b>Comments:</b>

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
none
<b>Comments:</b>

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
Spanish
<b>Comments:</b>

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 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
1,578	1,803	3,381
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,488	1,257	84.5	231
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

In the table below, report the number of 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 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,893	1,575	83.2	318
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 total 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
<b>Comments: EDfacts file being updated to report MFLEP Science results.</b>			

### 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	15
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	14
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	14
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	15
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	15
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	0
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

## 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 schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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
1,560	1,560	10

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under 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) ù The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course ù (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.	47
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	150

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.

\* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet 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 activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	5	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	4	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	8	
Other (Explain in comment box)	7	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	10	885
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	106
PD provided to principals	7	75
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	10	39
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	7	32
PD provided to community based organization personnel	2	27
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1,164</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	08/01/09	30
<b>Comments: There were 3 different months for districts to submit in 2008-09; 07/01; 08/01, or 09/01. They receive the funds within 30 days after each submission date.</b>		

### 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.

In 2009-10 there will be only 2 months for submission; 07/01 or 08/01. They will receive the funds within 30 days after each submission date.

### 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	
<b>Comments: There were no schools identified as persistently dangerous.</b>	

## 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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	75.3
Hispanic	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	66.8
Limited English proficient	58.9
Economically disadvantaged	70.4
Migratory students	77.8
Male	78.7
Female	85.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	7.5
Hispanic	8.0
White, non-Hispanic	4.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.3
Limited English proficient	5.1
Economically disadvantaged	4.2
Migratory students	9.1
Male	6.7
Female	4.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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	7	7
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	19	19
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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)	N<15	N<15
K	88	190
1	88	176
2	78	145
3	60	162
4	79	156
5	59	112
6	52	118
7	34	133
8	53	158
9	63	187
10	34	123
11	20	90
12	26	99
Ungraded		
Total	735	1,863
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	236	793
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	413	919
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<15	N<15
Hotels/Motels	84	140
Total	735	1,863
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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)	N<15
K	190
1	176
2	145
3	162
4	156
5	112
6	118
7	133
8	158
9	187
10	123
11	90
12	99
Ungraded	
Total	1,863
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	84
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	533
Limited English proficient students	71
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	6
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	4
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	9
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	9
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
School supplies	11
Referral to other programs and services	9
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional – in comment box below)	10
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 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 ESEA 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 ESEA.

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	124	90
4	116	74
5	79	52
6	78	45
7	94	68
8	110	65
High School	54	23
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State ESEA 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	125	80
4	116	75
5	80	46
6	78	39
7	94	40
8	110	50
High School	56	17
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 under 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	15
K	N<15
1	N<15
2	N<15
3	N<15
4	N<15
5	N<15
6	N<15
7	N<15
8	N<15
9	N<15
10	N<15
11	N<15
12	N<15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	33
Total	114
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2008-09 Category 1 numbers were less due to one or more of the following contributing factors:

- a. Loss of farmland;
- b. Closing of several migrant camps within the last 3 years;
- c. Existing camps have fewer children due to growers' request;
- d. 3-year eligibility ended and not enough new families were found who were eligible;
- e. Based on the new regulations no poultry workers were found eligible;
- f. Due to a late spring frost and heavy rains in 2009 many small Delaware farmers experienced a difficult growing season.

### 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<15
K	N<15
1	N<15
2	N<15
3	N<15
4	N<15
5	
6	
7	N<15
8	N<15
9	N<15
10	N<15
11	N<15
12	N<15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2008-09 Category 2 numbers increased slightly due to:

There were 2 new programs that Delaware funded for 2009, one in Kent County and one in Sussex County. Both programs improved services and outreach to Delaware families. With the improvement in services and an improvement in recruitment efforts in Sussex County, Delaware was able to serve more children.

### 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.

Delaware used NGS for Category 1 and 2 for 2008-09 and the previous reporting year 2007-08.

### 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.

Category 1 data was collected through a report run using NGS. NGS is the student information system used for the state of Delaware's Migrant Education Program. All eligible migrant students are entered into NGS. Identification and Recruitment is an on-going process that occurs year round. Once a student is recruited and a COE is initially completed it is turned in to the data entry person who crosschecks the information against the state database, DELSIS, (Delaware Student Information System), and NGS to check for accuracy and avoid duplications. In the case of children birth through 5 and out-of-school youth it is not applicable to crosscheck DELSIS. Once this is complete the COEs are given to the state migrant director for review. If the child/children listed on the COE are found to be eligible, all data on the national COE is entered into NGS.

Reports are run and reviewed monthly to ensure the records are kept up to date and valid. Also lists of students are sent to each district in the fall for them to verify enrollment. After September 1st residency verifications are done for all students by the state recruiter by phone or by home visits to ensure the students are present in the state. It is at this time the recruiter reviews the list of students to check Qualifying Arrival Dates to ensure all ineligible students are removed from the database and flag students whose eligibility will expire in the coming year.

Category 2 data is collected in a similar manner. All eligible migrant students are invited to participate in the 2 summer programs. Each program director keeps records on every student regarding attendance, course work and supplemental services. At the end of the summer program in early to mid August of 2009 the records are submitted to the SEA and verified by the state recruiter based on daily/weekly site visits made to the programs. The information is then given to the data entry person who also does another verification by email and phone if information looks questionable or incomplete. Upon her satisfaction the data is entered into NGS. The report is then run in NGS.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The recruiter completes the COE. It then goes through the quality control procedure at the state level. If the student(s) are determined to be eligible the migrant data entry person inputs the data into NGS. Data for child counts are crosschecked for accuracy in DELSIS. DELSIS only keeps information on pre-school students who are being served in special programs and all school-age students in K-12. However all data on migrant children identified in Delaware are entered into the NGS system. DELSIS provides the school information and is used to crosscheck eligible migrant students making child counts more accurate. During the year the migrant data entry person requests reports from NGS to determine migrant students for the reporting period. This data in NGS is crosschecked with school lists to verify accuracy. Additionally, throughout the year the recruiter reports all changes in the students' status on the COE supplemental form and notifies the data entry person. The data entry person then updates the student's file in NGS. At the end of the summer programs in early to mid August academic and supplemental service information are turned into the data entry person to be entered into NGS.

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.

Category 1 and 2 are collected in the same way.

### 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.

When a COE is turned in by the recruiter each student is checked in DELSIS to verify the school, grade, race, and birth date for accuracy. Then the student is checked both in DELSIS and NGS to ensure child counts are correct. Each student is only counted once even if the student has attended several schools during the reporting year. Summer program child counts are done using the time period that the summer school programs are in operation--July-August. All data is entered in NGS, as well as health data if applicable.

The recruiter supplies the information when a student is either pre-school age or is not currently attending school.

Delaware keeps a last qualifying move (LQM) date list. Both the migrant data entry person and the recruiter use the list to ensure only those migrant students who are currently eligible are counted. When a child turns three years of age they are counted if they are still here. Delaware only counts ages 3 to 21 years when their LQM date falls in the 3-year eligibility range. Students who are residents are confirmed by the recruiter through home visits telephone calls to the family or school personnel.

After the verification process is completed the count is pulled from NGS.

Delaware didn't have an intersession term for the reporting year of 2008-09 but had two summer programs. The two summer programs were held after the close of the regular school year--July-August. The child count for category 2 is done by requesting a report from NGS for students enrolled for that time period and school codes for the two sites which held summer migrant programs. The two summer migrant programs turn in forms which include attendance, supplemental program assistance, credit accrual, a Family Services form that includes areas of health, child and adult education, assistance with transportation, housing, food etc; a Parent Involvement form and the High School and Out of School Youth Progress form.

Only students for category 2 who actually attended the summer migrant program are included in the category 2 child count. To ensure that students are not previously enrolled under another name we do a crosscheck using birth date parent's name and place of birth. A check for possible duplicates is done at the initial time of entering the child in NGS. When the recruiter turns in a COE a check is done in DELSIS using the mother's last name and father's last name to verify the information. Sometimes when the student was entered into DELSIS the mother's last name was used and sometimes the father's last name was used. The age and race are also checked. If a student has the same birth date and the parent's name, race, grade, and the school they are attending match, then the data is entered in NGS. If there are discrepancies further follow-up is done by the recruiters or the migrant data entry person calls the schools. The recruiter makes contact with the families when there is a discrepancy. The migrant data entry person makes calls to schools to determine if the migrant student is attending their school and gets information to confirm the data.

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.

Category 1 and 2 are collected in the same way.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Delaware takes all reasonable and practical steps to ensure that proper eligibility determinations and verifications are being made.

The first step in Delaware's quality control process is to ensure that our recruiters are well trained. The state recruiter attends national conference when travel is allowed by the state. The state recruiter is in the process of developing a Recruiters Training Program for all other Delaware MEP staff who will be assisting in identification and recruitment.

The second step of Delaware's quality control process is to ensure the accuracy of the COE. During the training sessions for the recruiters the interview and completion of the COE are two elements that will be strongly emphasized. After the state recruiter has completed a COE she then reviews the information and crosschecks it using the NGS and DELSIS databases. This helps to eliminate duplicates and ensure accurate data collection. From there the data entry person will also review the COE before passing it to the State Migrant Director for final approval. Upon the DEMEP director's review the information is then entered into NGS.

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.

Re-interviewing is a method of quality control that requires each child listed on a COE be interviewed a second time by an interviewer who did not conduct the initial interview for the purposes of validating eligibility determinations.

The large majority, if not all migrant students come to Delaware during the late spring/summer months. Delaware had 2 new summer programs funded for 2009. The Directors of each program, after receiving additional training to re-interview, conducted the re-interviews. However, they were not begun until the fall of 2009. The number projected to re-interview in Kent and Sussex County was 71. The number of families that were actually contacted and interviewed was 13, and all 13 families were eligible. Several attempts were made to contact the other families.

As a result of 2008-09 outcomes, the process that will take place in Delaware in 2009-10 is as follows:

1. As part of a student's initial paperwork (Certification of Eligibility, Supplemental Form, Service Log) a re-interview form will be added to the file.
2. This file will be transferred to the County Program Directors who will conduct the re-interview at a time of their convenience within 1 month of receiving the paperwork.
3. The re-interview form will be kept on file with the County program until the end of the summer session in which all paperwork will be turned into the SEA.
4. In the case that the Sussex County Program Director has completed the initial interview the students file will be submitted to the State Recruiter who will conduct the re-interview. The same 1 month timeframe will be allowed.
5. For the students identified and recruited outside of the summer timeframe or for those students who do not participate in the MEP summer county programs it will remain the responsibility of the County Program Director of the county in which the student resides to conduct the re-interview.
6. Upon the completion of the re-interview and submission of the paperwork the DEMEP director will review the paperwork and accept or negate the findings or ask for additional evidence.
7. In the case that the DEMEP director has negated the findings the COE will be void from the records and the children will be removed from the eligibility count.

DEDOE encourages County Program Directors and recruiters to conduct re-interviews face to face; however it is allowable to conduct re-interviews via telephone when face to face is determined to be impractical.

All individuals conducting re-interviews must be trained in identification and recruitment.

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.

Throughout the year migrant students are recruited and enrolled and school lists are updated. Students are checked in DELSIS to verify that the migrant students are in the correct schools. Then school lists are requested from NGS and comparisons are made to make sure the information is the same. In addition the state recruiter and data entry person work together as a system of checks and balances to ensure all data is maintained accurately on a monthly basis.

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 SEA? Once the 2 summer schools end around mid August, the data entry person takes the state's final steps to ensure accuracy by manually checking the data. The recruiter in September reviews the COEs. This is the catch all method to review and verify that all students are eligible. We review the following scenarios: residency, age (turning 3 or turning 22), and remaining years of eligibility. A combination of using DELSIS and MSIX with home visits, ensures accuracy in reporting.

The State Director reviews every COE for accuracy once it is finalized by the recruiter and the data entry person.

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.

As a result of the re-interviewing the SEA will continue to ensure the quality of its local summer migrant programs, by providing training to the directors and other recruiters to the extent that the program's capacity allows and if the DEDOE approves travel to conferences and other training provided by the US OME.

As of September 2009 Delaware is in the process of developing a New Recruiters Training document covering all aspects of recruitment with a special emphasis on eligibility.

DEDOE will continue to ensure that the re-interview procedures described in 1.10.3.4 are annually reviewed and revised if necessary.

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.

Delaware has no concerns at this time.