

# **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**

**IDAHO**



**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:  
Idaho State Board of Education

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

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Scott Grothe

Telephone: 208-332-1572

Fax: 208-334-2632

e-mail: [scott.grothe@osbe.idaho.gov](mailto:scott.grothe@osbe.idaho.gov)

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

Friday, March 12, 2010, 3:50:42 PM

Signature

Date

**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.

Mathematics Idaho Content Standards in Mathematics (9-12 Course Specific Standards) were approved by the Idaho State Legislature in January 2009. These standards were implemented in the fall of 2009 by Idaho school districts. The 9-12 course specific standards are in addition to our grade-level content standards and designed to support classroom instruction as new graduation requirements take effect for the Class of 2013. Revision work began on the K-8 content standards in mathematics in 2009, but was halted when the Common Core State Standards Initiative memorandum of agreement was signed by the Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Idaho Governor. Focus groups have been convened to review the draft College and Career Readiness Standards and the Draft K-8 Common Core Standards in mathematics. Public comments have been gathered and reviewed and forwarded on to CCSSO and NGA for further study. If Idaho pursues adopting the Common Core Standards in Mathematics, the process will begin in April 2010 with the document being sent to the State Board of Education to begin the rulemaking process.

Science Content Standards in Chemistry (Grade 11-12) were adopted into temporary rule by the State Legislature in January 2009. Revision of the Idaho content limits in Science (Grade K-12) began in August 2009. Revised science content limits will be completed by April 2010 and sent to the State Board of Education for a pending rule. If granted, the standards will be open for a 21-day public comment period in June 2010 before returning to the State board of Education for a proposed rule in August 2010. If the State board of Education approves, the revised Idaho Content Standards in Science (Grade K-12) will be sent to the State Legislature in January 2011 for approval with curricular material adoption in September 2011.

English Language Arts and Reading The Idaho Content Standards in English Language Arts will be reviewed and revised during the 2010-2011 school year. The revised content standards will go to the State Board of Education in April 2011 for a pending rule. If granted, the standards will be open for a 21 day public comment period in June 2011 before returning to the State board of Education for a proposed rule in August 2011. If the State board of Education approves, the revised Idaho Content Standards in ELA (Grade K-12) will be sent to the State Legislature in January 2012 for approval with curricular material adoption in September 2012. A Common Core State Standards Initiative memorandum of agreement was signed by the Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Idaho Governor. Focus groups have been convened to review the draft College and Career Readiness Standards and the Draft K-8 Common Core Standards in English Language Arts. Public comments have been gathered and reviewed and forwarded on to CCSSO and NGA for further study. If Idaho pursues adopting the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts, the process will begin in April 2010 with the document being sent to the State Board of Education to begin the rulemaking process.

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

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State will continue to use the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) in reading, math and language usage for grades 3-8 and 10. The ISAT in reading, math and language usage was peer reviewed and received full approval in November 2006.

The ISAT-Alt, the alternate assessment, has been revised in math, reading and language usage into a portfolio system and will be administered in spring 2010. The entire new ISAT-Alt online collection and scoring system in reading, math, and language usage will be submitted for peer review in Fall 2010.

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

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The State will continue to use the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) in science for grades 5, 7, and 10. The ISAT-Science was peer reviewed and received unofficial full approval in November 2009.

The ISAT-Alt Science was submitted for peer review in October 2009. The state has received preliminary notes back and is working with the US Department of Education to meet the remaining requirements.

The ISAT-Alt, the alternate assessment, continues to be revised. The ISAT-Alt Science was revised into a portfolio system and administered in spring 2009. In addition, the ISAT-Alt in science will be electronic portfolio submission and scoring.

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	145,606		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,341		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,568		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	1,817		>97%
Hispanic	20,848		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	117,165		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,698		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,459		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	63,574		>97%
Migratory students	1,410		>97%
Male	74,748		>97%
Female	70,858		>97%
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(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	4,442	33.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,852	58.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,184	8.8
Total	13,478	
<b>Comments:</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	145,606		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,341		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,568	2,447	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,817	1,759	96.8
Hispanic	20,848		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	117,165		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,698		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,459	8,038	95.0
Economically disadvantaged students	63,574		>97%
Migratory students	1,410		>97%
Male	74,748		>97%
Female	70,858		>97%
<b>Comments:</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	12,189	90.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	101	0.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,196	8.9
Total	13,486	
<b>Comments:</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	61,989		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	999	962	96.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,100		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	802		>97%
Hispanic	8,705		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	50,061		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,631		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,469		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	25,728		>97%
Migratory students	565		>97%
Male	31,899		>97%
Female	30,090		>97%
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

## 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.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,795	32.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,182	58.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	487	8.9
Total	5,464	
<b>Comments:</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

<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	21,230	18,355	86.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	308	199	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	390	341	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	266	188	70.7
Hispanic	3,215	2,401	74.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,898	15,108	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,144	1,220	56.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,361	777	57.1
Economically disadvantaged students	10,028	8,024	80.0
Migratory students	209	133	63.6
Male	10,949	9,408	85.9
Female	10,281	8,947	87.0
<b>Comments:</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

<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	21,175	18,367	86.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	308	221	71.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	377	340	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	259	193	74.5
Hispanic	3,200	2,371	74.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,883	15,121	89.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,144	1,144	53.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,295	745	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	9,991	8,042	80.5
Migratory students	206	131	63.6
Male	10,920	9,206	84.3
Female	10,255	9,161	89.3
<b>Comments:</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.

**1.3.3.1 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: Idaho administered the science ISAT in grades 5, 7 and 10, not in third grade.</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	21,349	18,258	85.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	237	67.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	356	329	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	240	158	65.8
Hispanic	3,110	2,325	74.8
White, non-Hispanic	17,120	15,070	88.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,165	1,159	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,379	798	57.9
Economically disadvantaged students	10,067	8,009	79.6
Migratory students	216	151	69.9
Male	10,880	9,233	84.9
Female	10,469	9,025	86.2
<b>Comments: Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and the State MEP Coordinator will continue to work collaboratively to assure Migrant students are coded and accounted for. Factors that may have an impact on the discrepancy in numbers between the State assessment database and the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) are as follows: migrant students not being correctly coded on State assessments, migrant students who moved and were not tested (accounted for in MSIS), Migrant students who were also LEP and in the first 12 months of being in a school therefore exempted from testing, or migrant students who left school, or dropped out, and didn't re-enroll. Need Migrant comment</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.

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

Grade 4	# 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	21,302	18,386	86.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	350	248	70.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	346	326	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	234	165	70.5
Hispanic	3,093	2,219	71.7
White, non-Hispanic	17,114	15,290	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,164	1,179	54.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,309	689	52.6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,031	7,997	79.7
Migratory students	212	137	64.6
Male	10,859	9,169	84.4
Female	10,443	9,217	88.3

**Comments: Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and the State MEP Coordinator will continue to work collaboratively to assure Migrant students are coded and accounted for. Factors that may have an impact on the discrepancy in numbers between the State assessment database and the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) are as follows: migrant students not being correctly coded on State assessments, migrant students who moved and were not tested (accounted for in MSIS), Migrant students who were also LEP and in the first 12 months of being in a school therefore exempted from testing, or migrant students who left school, or dropped out, and didn't re-enroll.**

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

Grade 4	# 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			
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			

**Comments: Idaho administered the science ISAT in grades 5, 7 and 10, not in fourth grade.**

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	20,696	16,136	78.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	169	52.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	347	291	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	282	156	55.3
Hispanic	3,097	1,969	63.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,494	13,435	81.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,089	809	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,303	561	43.0
Economically disadvantaged students	9,846	6,835	69.4
Migratory students	215	121	56.3
Male	10,725	8,354	77.9
Female	9,971	7,782	78.0
<b>Comments:</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.

### 1.3.2.3 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	20,637	17,852	86.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	224	69.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	335	300	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	272	206	75.7
Hispanic	3,082	2,303	74.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,478	14,688	89.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,084	1,053	50.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,236	664	53.7
Economically disadvantaged students	9,809	7,831	79.8
Migratory students	214	139	65.0
Male	10,696	9,083	84.9
Female	9,941	8,769	88.2
<b>Comments:</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.

### 1.3.3.3 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	20,657	13,734	66.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	317	129	40.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	345	244	70.7
Black, non-Hispanic	278	129	46.4
Hispanic	3,090	1,304	42.2
White, non-Hispanic	16,473	11,828	71.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,084	706	33.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,238	257	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	9,825	5,359	54.5
Migratory students	216	65	30.1
Male	10,709	7,270	67.9
Female	9,948	6,464	65.0
<b>Comments:</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	20,287	15,869	78.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	212	60.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	354	291	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	258	169	65.5
Hispanic	2,948	1,751	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	16,272	13,362	82.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,894	684	36.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,122	393	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	9,155	6,332	69.2
Migratory students	223	112	50.2
Male	10,415	8,196	78.7
Female	9,872	7,673	77.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.4 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	20,243	17,348	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	246	70.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	339	295	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	257	193	75.1
Hispanic	2,923	2,121	72.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,272	14,403	88.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,904	906	47.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,055	495	46.9
Economically disadvantaged students	9,122	7,182	78.7
Migratory students	218	135	61.9
Male	10,401	8,682	83.5
Female	9,842	8,666	88.0
<b>Comments:</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.

### 1.3.3.4 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			
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: Idaho administered the science ISAT in grades 5, 7 and 10, not in sixth grade.</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.

### 1.3.1.5 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	20,825	15,674	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	354	214	60.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	376	291	77.4
Black, non-Hispanic	281	178	63.4
Hispanic	2,895	1,574	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	16,818	13,352	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,861	561	30.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,139	378	33.2
Economically disadvantaged students	8,823	5,671	64.3
Migratory students	211	107	50.7
Male	10,699	7,958	74.4
Female	10,126	7,716	76.2
<b>Comments:</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.

### 1.3.2.5 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	20,797	17,748	85.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	358	261	72.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	358	310	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	277	210	75.8
Hispanic	2,882	2,008	69.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,821	14,879	88.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,868	795	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,084	516	47.6
Economically disadvantaged students	8,802	6,833	77.6
Migratory students	208	117	56.2
Male	10,686	8,866	83.0
Female	10,111	8,882	87.8
<b>Comments:</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.

### 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -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	20,774	11,636	56.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	355	130	36.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	372	221	59.4
Black, non-Hispanic	282	112	39.7
Hispanic	2,885	828	28.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,781	10,304	61.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,848	406	22.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,082	137	12.7
Economically disadvantaged students	8,793	3,771	42.9
Migratory students	206	50	24.3
Male	10,679	6,233	58.4
Female	10,095	5,403	53.5

**Comments: There have been no changes to the reporting of race and ethnicity. Due to very small numbers of Black, non-Hispanic students, a change (increase) of only 54 students statewide triggers this error message. Counts have been checked by district and the increases in the counts of Black, non-Hispanic students were proportionately spread across the state.**

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	20,386	16,001	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	325	220	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	361	291	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	242	150	62.0
Hispanic	2,799	1,666	59.5
White, non-Hispanic	16,549	13,593	82.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,751	574	32.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,093	419	38.3
Economically disadvantaged students	8,400	5,785	68.9
Migratory students	184	100	54.4
Male	10,387	8,159	78.6
Female	9,999	7,842	78.4

**Comments:**

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online 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	20,339	18,604	91.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	324	275	84.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	339	317	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	237	195	82.3
Hispanic	2,783	2,267	81.5
White, non-Hispanic	16,547	15,452	93.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,753	981	56.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,028	655	63.7
Economically disadvantaged students	8,362	7,247	86.7
Migratory students	178	128	71.9
Male	10,367	9,280	89.5
Female	9,972	9,324	93.5
<b>Comments:</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.

### 1.3.3.6 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			
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: Idaho administered the science ISAT in grades 5, 7 and 10, not in eighth grade.</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.

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -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	19,883	15,593	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	301	190	63.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	361	281	77.8
Black, non-Hispanic	230	120	52.2
Hispanic	2,620	1,600	61.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,310	13,366	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,574	519	33.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	992	374	37.7
Economically disadvantaged students	6,812	4,629	68.0
Migratory students	134	67	50.0
Male	10,162	8,030	79.0
Female	9,721	7,563	77.8

**Comments: Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and the State MEP Coordinator will continue to work collaboratively to assure Migrant students are coded and accounted for. Factors that may have an impact on the discrepancy in numbers between the State assessment database and the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) are as follows: migrant students not being correctly coded on State assessments, migrant students who moved and were not tested (accounted for in MSIS), Migrant students who were also LEP and in the first 12 months of being in a school therefore exempted from testing, or migrant students who left school, or dropped out, and didn't re-enroll. Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and the State MEP Coordinator will continue to work collaboratively to assure Migrant students are coded and accounted for. Factors that may have an impact on the discrepancy in numbers between the State assessment database and the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) are as follows: migrant students not being correctly coded on State assessments, migrant students who moved and were not tested (accounted for in MSIS), Migrant students who were also LEP and in the first 12 months of being in a school therefore exempted from testing, or migrant students who left school, or dropped out, and didn't re-enroll.**

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

### 1.3.2.7 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	19,791	17,603	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	298	244	81.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	294	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	223	151	67.7
Hispanic	2,603	1,948	74.8
White, non-Hispanic	16,254	14,915	91.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,569	763	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	925	466	50.4
Economically disadvantaged students	6,775	5,508	81.3
Migratory students	131	75	57.2
Male	10,115	8,879	87.8
Female	9,676	8,724	90.2

**Comments: Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and the State MEP Coordinator will continue to work collaboratively to assure Migrant students are coded and accounted for. Factors that may have an impact on the discrepancy in numbers between the State assessment database and the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) are as follows: migrant students not being correctly coded on State assessments, migrant students who moved and were not tested (accounted for in MSIS), Migrant students who were also LEP and in the first 12 months of being in a school therefore exempted from testing, or migrant students who left school, or dropped out, and didn't re-enroll.**

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -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	19,603	13,486	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	290	138	47.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	351	240	68.4
Black, non-Hispanic	224	107	47.8
Hispanic	2,562	1,066	41.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,116	11,896	73.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,532	438	28.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	902	153	17.0
Economically disadvantaged students	6,685	3,681	55.1
Migratory students	132	37	28.0
Male	10,015	7,106	71.0
Female	9,588	6,380	66.5

**Comments: Idaho SDE does not have a longitudinal data system. Therefore, we cannot verify migrant counts across agencies. Future remedies consist of a unique student ID number and the development of a longitudinal data system. The Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and the State MEP Coordinator will continue to work collaboratively to assure Migrant students are coded and accounted for. Factors that may have an impact on the discrepancy in numbers between the State assessment database and the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) are as follows: migrant students not being correctly coded on State assessments, migrant students who moved and were not tested (accounted for in MSIS), Migrant students who were also LEP and in the first 12 months of being in a school therefore exempted from testing, or migrant students who left school, or dropped out, and didn't re-enroll.**

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	652	432	66.3
Districts	131	59	45.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 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	375	242	64.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	159	98	61.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	216	144	66.7
<b>Comments: The improvement in AYP results is due to several factors. 1) In July 2009, Idaho was approved by the US Department of Education to use an indexing system for calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Under the new calculations, students in the "Basic" proficiency category are now counted as .5. Idaho also reset the Annual Measurable Objectives; however, with the new calculations a greater number of schools achieved the targets and made AYP. 2) The overall scale score for reading achievement in the state also improved indicating an increase in the performance of students. 3) More schools used the safe harbor provision to meet AYP.</b>			

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

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

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 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
111	45	40.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 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	18
Extension of the school year or school day	91
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	17
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	18
<b>Comments: NA</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	2
<b>Comments: NA</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.

NA
----

## 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.

Identification: Based on the Spring 2008 ISAT results, a large number of schools and districts in Idaho were identified as on Alert status, Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, Corrective Action, and Restructuring. School improvement plans were required, support was provided during the development process, and a review including feedback was conducted. All in improvement status, regardless of the level, were invited to participate in a series of technical assistance opportunities further described below. Additional support was provided to those in Restructuring. School Improvement Regional Workshops: A series of School Improvement workshops were offered regionally throughout the state in the fall of 2008. 244 educators including superintendents, central office staff, principals, other building leadership, instructional coaches, and teachers participated in the workshops, representing 163 different districts and schools. Some came as individuals, and others brought teams to participate in the trainings which provided information on an array of school improvement related topics including utilizing the 9 Characteristics of High Performing Schools, overcoming resistance in the change process, and establishing roles and alignment as linked to meaningful and effective change conversation. Take away resources designed to support the implementation of school improvement efforts were supplied for participants as related to both presentation topics, and the CIP (Continuous Improvement Planning) Tool utilized for writing and submitting school improvement plans. A guidance document was developed and distributed, and one-on-one support was provided to anyone needing assistance during the plan development and writing process. These workshop sessions were presented by the state school improvement coordinator, and a team of 2-3 other exemplary educators in each region, including the newly established regional school improvement coordinators in partnership with Idaho universities. CIP Tool Webinars: A series of webinar sessions were presented for anyone needing assistance in utilizing the CIP Tool for writing and submitting required school improvement plans. 74 registrations were submitted for this webinar series, however it is unknown if it was an individual participating in the webinar, or a team of educators that logged in for the distance learning. Additionally, the webinar sessions were archived and made available for later access. 9 Characteristics of High Performing Schools Webinars: As the state rolled out the 9 Characteristics of High Performing Schools as a foundational, driving document in the area of school improvement, a series of monthly webinars were provided to all, regardless of specific improvement status, as related to each characteristic (9 months of school; 9 characteristics). These webinars were developed and delivered by the school improvement team, in partnership with several other divisions at the State Department of Education. Idaho Live, a webinar technology system coordinated by the Idaho Digital Learning Academy, was utilized for both registration and delivery of this webinar series. Again, for each registration it is unknown if it was an individual participating in the webinar, or a team of educators that logged in for the distance learning. Additionally, the webinar sessions were archived and made available for later access. Presentations and materials from these sessions were widely accessed and utilized across the state. Restructuring: Deputy Superintendent Marybeth Flachbart personally developed and delivered additional support provided to schools identified for restructuring. This support was a mixture of additional requirements, such as individual action plans for each indicator that AYP was not met that were written, reviewed, and utilized for coaching conversations. Additional webinars and support sessions were provided, as well as one-on-one visits and coaching conversations. One-on-one Technical Assistance: Additional one-on-one technical assistance was provided on an individual basis as requested by schools and districts, or as identified by the State Department.

### 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).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	21
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	19
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	3
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	6
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	1
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	1
Restructured the district	5
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	34	6
Schools	76	32
<b>Comments: Some schools had already made AYP and were appealed to help the district potentially make AYP.</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	08/13/09
---	----------

### 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	9,110	9,233
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	6,553	6,618
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	71.9	71.7
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	9,086	9,215
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	7,405	7,142
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	81.5	77.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	18
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	10
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	22
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
6 = Combo 1	The Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) project is a new system of support for Idaho schools and districts that are in needs improvement status. Based on a needs assessment that indicated a need for increased support and technical assistance to Idaho schools and districts in needs improvement status, additional federal grant funds were obtained to jump start a pilot project to establish a state wide system of support in Idaho.	39	18	12	A	


**Comments:**

--

#### Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

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

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

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

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

#### Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School improvement strategies were shared with LEAs and schools through fall annual meetings, regional school improvement workshops, the distribution of hard copy and electronic resources, webinars, teleconferences, weekly e-newsletters sent from the State Department of Education, mass emailing, the Idaho school improvement website <http://csi.boisestate.edu/Improvement/SIHome.html> and one-on-one technical assistance visits and meetings. Additionally, feedback was provided through narrative comments and a scoring rubric used to evaluate the quality of strategies being used in school improvement plans.

Scope of the Project: The Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) project is a new system of support for Idaho schools and districts that are in needs improvement status. Based on a needs assessment that indicated a need for increased support and technical assistance to Idaho schools and districts in needs improvement status, additional federal grant funds were obtained to jump start a pilot project to establish a state wide system of support in Idaho. The pilot project (Cohort I) began in January, 2008 and is serving 19 sites for a three year period. The project will provide scaffolded support designed to assist Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in building their own internal capacity to sustain their school improvement efforts. A rigorous school and district selection process has been developed, with a goal to select schools and districts that are in needs improvement status and serve a high percentage of at-risk students (combined percentage of economically disadvantaged, migratory, English language learners, and students with disabilities) and have limited local resources.

Capacity Builders (CBs): A key component of this state wide system of support is the utilization of recently retired, highly distinguished educators that are trained by the state to assist school and district leaders as they facilitate the work of school improvement in Idaho's neediest schools and districts. Capacity Builders (CBs) are assigned to a school or district site within the IBC network. They are provided with monthly training and given guidance on the work of school improvement. However, the IBC project does not prescribe to a cookie-cutter approach to school improvement. Capacity Builders are provided with a "tool kit" of school improvement resources, and then in partnership with school and district leaders, help create and implement a customized school improvement plan.

Regional Expansion of IBC in Partnership with ID Universities:

The coordination for the Idaho Building Capacity project was initially located at the Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies (CSI & PS) at Boise State University (Southwestern Region). Regional IBC Support Centers have also been established at the University of Idaho (Northern Region) and Idaho State University (Southeastern Region) and began serving sites statewide in February, 2009. While individual centers have been created in each region, there will be a uniform and systematic approach for delivering services, in order to establish continuity in the state wide system of support. The coordination of IBC regional centers will operate through the Idaho State Department of Education and the State School Improvement Coordinator. The three regions combined will be serving 35 sites representing Cohort II over three year process starting in February 2009. Combined with Cohort I, this totals to 54 sites currently being served in the IBC project.

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: 4.0 %

**Comments: The 1003g funds were used to support the Idaho Building Capacity project, a cornerstone of Idaho's statewide system of support. Through this project, 39 school sites were served at an increased level that included up to 8 hours a week on-site technical assistance from an outside trained consultant (distinguished educator), professional development, and additional resources. 5% was utilized for administrative support, and 95% flowed through to districts, which they used to secure contracts with one of Idaho's regional school improvement support centers, housed at Idaho Universities, recognized as IBC providers.**

The State Department is currently working with both our Regional Comprehensive Center, and one of the Content Centers (Center for Innovation and Improvement) to develop and implement an effective evaluation system for our statewide system of support, including the Idaho Building Capacity project.

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.

The 1003g funds were used to support the Idaho Building Capacity project, a cornerstone of Idaho's statewide system of support. Through this project, 39 school sites were served at an increased level that included up to 8 hours a week on-site technical assistance from an outside trained consultant (distinguished educator), professional development, and additional resources. 5% was utilized for administrative support, and 95% flowed through to districts, which they used to secure contracts with one of Idaho's regional school improvement support centers, housed at Idaho Universities, recognized as IBC providers.

The State Department is currently working with both our Regional Comprehensive Center, and one of the Content Centers (Center for Innovation and Improvement) to develop and implement an effective evaluation system for our statewide system of support, including the Idaho Building Capacity project.

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.

The only funds used for School Improvement at this time are 1003 (a) and 1003 (g)

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	54,766
Applied to transfer	387
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	47

##### 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	\$ 88,652

##### 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	63

## 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	30,436
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,062
Received supplemental educational services	1,021
<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	\$ 902,512
<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	35,633	33,853	95.0	1,780	5.0
All elementary classes	9,853	9,320	94.6	533	5.4
All secondary classes	25,780	24,533	95.2	1,247	4.8

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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

This year's data includes special education core content classes for the first time in compliance with the guidance. Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State 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	60.6
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	33.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	6.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	75.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	14.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 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	2,473	2,318	93.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	2,067	1,894	91.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	3,177	2,917	91.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	10,718	10,347	96.5

**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	61.5	36.8
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	51.6	30.6
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	

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

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- 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
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The "other" category would include full day or extended day Kindergarten and study skills classes.

## 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	18,145
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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.	16,697
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	15,290
North American Indian	275
Reserved for local use	259
Russian	237
Arabic	180

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

The QAA field in the Library of Congress (LOC) List signifies "reserved for local use", as indicated above. This was used by one LEA that has a large number of refugee students. The majority of the number indicated in the reserved for local use is comprised of Dari, Farsi, Kizigua, Mai Mai and Kirundi languages. These languages may have "mother tongues" as the Library of Congress List suggests, however the language issue is very political with parents and students. The mother tongue very likely was the ethnic group that violated the language group represented. The Idaho State Department of Education is working with the LEA to identify these languages to see where they can fit into other categories provided by the LOC list, while at the same time maintaining parent's right to choose languages.

### 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	16,718
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,427
Total	18,145
<b>Comments: The number not tested includes students who withdrew or who were exited from the LEP program before the testing window, students who are "extended resource" and who were unable to complete the assessment.</b>	

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	6,188
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	37.0
<b>Comments: Idaho changed the AMAO targets and definitions for progress and proficiency in January 2009. The USDOE approved those changes in February 2009. The new targets and definitions informed the spring 2009 Idaho English language proficiency assessment (IELA). Therefore there is a significant change in the number and percent proficient from the last reporting year.</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	15,450
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,247
Total	16,697
<b>Comments: There are LEP students served who were not tested, due to leaving the district or exiting the LEP Program before the assessment window, or because they are extended resource (severely cognitively disabled) and do not have the ability to take the assessment.</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.	1,162

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	4,235	25.7		25.00
ELP attainment	5,665	34.4		13.00

**Comments: Idaho only has state targets for the percent % of students making progress and attaining proficiency, rather than a fixed number #. In the Eden/Edfacts upload file, it automatically calculates the total amount from the number of students making progress and the number of students reaching proficiency. The issue is that Idaho includes some students in both calculations because it is possible for a student to make progress, while at the same time meeting proficiency. It has been Idaho's understanding that this is allowed under the Title III regulations. Because Idaho does this, the AMAO targets should be Progress: 39.14% for Title III LEAs. Proficiency/attainment should be: 36.67% for Title III LEAs. Because the Eden/Edfacts system does not allow for this, then the numbers reflected above are different because of the automatic calculation in the uploaded file. Idaho needs clarification whether this practice of including some LEP students in both the proficiency/attainment and the progress categories is allowable.**

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments: Idaho only offers the state content tests in English and allows for accommodations.</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)
Not Applicable
<b>Comments: Idaho only offers the state content tests in English and allows for accommodations.</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)
Not Applicable
<b>Comments: Idaho only offers the state content tests in English and allows for accommodations.</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)
Not Applicable
<b>Comments: Idaho only offers the state content tests in English and allows for accommodations.</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
1,816	1,678	3,494
<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
1,910	1,608	84.2	302
<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
1,908	1,733	90.8	175
<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
623	312	50.1	311
<b>Comments:</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	38
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	19
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	35
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	38
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	18
# -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 2008-09)	0
<b>Comments: All Idaho LEAs are in the same annual cycle (currently Year 3) of meeting or not meeting AMAO targets, as Idaho's baseline for the new statewide assessment was the 2005-2006 school year. Most LEAs did not meet the AMAO targets in 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. Therefore those LEAs were in LEA Improvement after the testing in spring of 2009. All LEAs in improvement status submitted LEA improvement plans and have received technical assistance. School year 2008-2009 is Year 3 of the consecutive years and the LEAs in improvement status are implementing their LEA Improvement Plan. Testing for 2009-2010 will determine if any LEAs do not meet the AMAOs for 4 consecutive years.</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>No</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
2,801	662	22

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,193
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	20

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:

- Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
- #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.)**
- Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
- Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	34	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	28	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	29	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	34	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	30	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	36	3,915
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	37	711
PD provided to principals	36	431
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	34	319
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	34	1,031
PD provided to community based organization personnel	9	334
Total	38	6,741

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were a total of 38 LEAs that received Title III Language Acquisition funding.

## 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
7/8/09	7/8/09	1
<b>Comments: Idaho uses a quarterly cash balance report process for the request of monthly federal funds. Each LEA is required to submit a quarterly report and payments are made monthly immediately after the LEA request is received.</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.

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

## 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 are no Persistently Dangerous Schools in IDAHO for SY0809. Response from ED Facts on why a 0 is not displayed and why finishing the section warns that the question is not answered: Thank you for contacting ED Fact's Partner Support Center (PSC). Per our conversation regarding CSPR File 1.7, the Department of Education is aware this section does not display "0". As long as file N130 is complete, the information will be reported. If you have any questions or need additional information, please reference ticket # 108858 to expedite support.</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	89.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	81.6
Hispanic	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	88.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	76.7
Limited English proficient	80.9
Economically disadvantaged	83.0
Migratory students	53.3
Male	85.7
Female	88.5
<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.

The data reported is derived from the transitional graduation rate used by Idaho. Idaho is using the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) formula outlined in the Idaho Accountability Workbook, section 7.1.

Idaho is working toward full implementation of the required graduation rate in Section 200.19. Our progress is such: The State of Idaho was awarded a State Longitudinal Data System grant from the US Department of Education in May 2009. Ten LEAs will pilot the SLDS system in spring 2010 with full implementation to all LEAs in fall 2010. Spring 2011 will be the first collection period for the four-year cohort-based graduation collection. Thus, in July 2013, Idaho will report the three-year cohort graduation rates for those high schools in Idaho that only encompass grades 10, 11 and 12. In July 2014, Idaho will begin reporting the four-year cohort graduation rate for the remaining high schools.

### 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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	2.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1.5
Hispanic	3.5
White, non-Hispanic	1.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.3
Limited English proficient	3.2
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	3.8
Male	2.2
Female	1.8
<b>Comments: Cannot calculate a dropout event rate for the Economically Disadvantaged student group as grade level information on total enrollment data is not collected.</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	125	125
LEAs with subgrants	9	9
Total	134	134
<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)	11	45
K	63	142
1	72	167
2	86	169
3	77	185
4	79	184
5	80	163
6	57	139
7	59	127
8	49	95
9	70	110
10	52	86
11	69	73
12	88	112
Ungraded		N<10
Total	912	1,798
<b>Comments: N/A</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.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	56	225
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	711	1,427
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	93	68
Hotels/Motels	52	78
Total	912	1,798
<b>Comments: N/A</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)	115
K	77
1	108
2	92
3	115
4	126
5	113
6	111
7	95
8	64
9	74
10	66
11	64
12	80
Ungraded	N<10
Total	1,301
<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	46
Migratory children/youth	N<10
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	179
Limited English proficient students	180
<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	8
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	4
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	9
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	9
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	7
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
School supplies	9
Referral to other programs and services	7
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	4
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Did not collect description of "Other" in this category. For 2009-2010 data collection, a comment box to capture description of "Other" will be included.

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	1
School Selection	0
Transportation	2
School records	2
Immunizations	2
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Identifying and assisting secondary students is a challenge we are addressing  
Access to Community Records

### 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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient</b>
3	81	56
4	92	68
5	94	71
6	51	35
7	59	38
8	53	44
High School	31	22
<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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient</b>
3	82	53
4	92	67
5	95	59
6	49	27
7	58	25
8	52	23
High School	32	19
<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)	697
K	345
1	321
2	424
3	308
4	295
5	281
6	277
7	288
8	267
9	246
10	213
11	152
12	113
Ungraded	68
Out-of-school	227
Total	4,522
<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.

NA

### 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)	176
K	162
1	168
2	189
3	137
4	114
5	127
6	99
7	81
8	61
9	41
10	25
11	12
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,406
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho State Migrant Student Information System has been in use for close to 6 years now. The system was built by contract and in-house resources and is a secure web application using SQL 2008 to house data. The system generates and compiles reports using SQL queries on the Student level information. The system was used to compile and report Idaho's Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts for SY0809 and SY0708.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho utilizes the following people to collect and manage the child count data: 7 Migrant Regional Coordinators, 1 Migrant data administrator and IT management (Federal Data Manager Programmer Project Manager) at the State level. The Migrant system collects details on student demographics, student enrollment, movement history, regular and summer services being provided, test scores, secondary grades/credits and immunization records on active students enrolled in the State's MEP program. Each year the system is rolled over and all students are re-qualified and re-certified by the Regional Coordinators and districts for accurate counts. The rollover of the Migrant application for SY 07-08 occurred in December 2008 and in November 2009 for SY 08-09. Prior to the rollover, Regional Coordinators are required to verify migrant student information and reconcile Migrant student counts with each district. District reports are populated through the system that the Regional Coordinators and each MEP district use to verify student counts and student data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children are counted if they reach 3 years old by the end of the eligible period 8/31/2009 for SY 0809 and if they are not older than 21 at the start of the eligible period 9/1/2008 for SY 08-09. This is done by queries when the reports are generated and compiled.

Students are activated for the SY 08-09 by the Regional Coordinators and Migrant data administrator if they are active as a resident or student for at least one day from 9/1/2008 to 8/31/2009 for the SY 08-09.

The District reports do not display children whose: QA date generates an eligibility date that does not fall into the range of 9/1/2008 to 8/31/2009 for SY 08-09 and the EOE data is out of range for SY 08-09.

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

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

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

### 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.

LEA recruiters are required to verify all information on the COE is accurate and true. The COE is then forwarded to the Regional ID&R Coordinator who is then responsible for verifying the accuracy and validity of the information on the COE. The Regional ID&R Coordinator must then sign the COE indicating this has been done and the eligibility is valid. The COE is then sent to the State. The IMEP administrative assistant reviews the COE for accuracy and validity. If corrections are necessary or the eligibility is invalid, the COE is returned to the Regional ID&R Coordinator for corrections and/or communication to LEA recruiter regarding eligibility. Before students are entered into the system or existing students' information is updated, the IMEP migrant data administrator reviews each new COE once more to ensure that all necessary information is provided by checking each qualifying activity to assure it is valid, time of year that the move was made and if the activity is done in the area that the move was made to. The data administrator then enters the data from the COE into the Idaho computerized data system. The Regional Coordinators update the existing student data for their assigned districts to maintain records and re-qualify eligible students. When a question or concern of possible duplication arises, Regional Coordinators contact the State Migrant data administrator for resolution. The State Migrant data administrator compares the COE data to what is in the computerized data system and makes any necessary changes or deletions so that the child count is accurate. This quality control process is outlined in the Flow of the COE that was created by the IMEP in SY08-09. The IMEP has also created an Eligibility Protocol and established a Decision-Making Chain of Command which will be implemented SY09-10.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has a statewide COE. Regional recruiters and district family liaisons determine student eligibility by interviewing the parents, guardians, or other responsible adult(s) of potential migrant students. In addition, regional recruiters and family liaisons interview the person directly if he or she is self eligible for the Migrant Education Program. Title I-C monitoring visits are also an assured process in evaluating quality control. Statewide re-interviewing was also completed during April/May of 2009 for SY 09-10. MERC provided family recruiters/liaisons with professional development in Identification and Recruitment during the regular and summer/intersession.

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.

The IMEP conducted a State-wide Prospective Re-Interviewing during April/May of 2009 for SY08-09 student counts. A random sample of 80 eligibility determinations was taken from Idaho's Migrant Student Information System. Regional Identification and Recruitment Coordinators conducted the re-interviews. They conducted the re-interviews in a region other than their own. The target was to complete 50 re-interviews. An additional 30 eligibility determinations were identified to serve as alternate re-interviews if any in the first 50 had moved or declined an interview. In total, there was an 84% participation rate (completed/attempted to contact). There were 52 completed interviews with an eligibility determination. 50 were found eligible and 2 of those were found to be ineligible. The defect rate was calculated at 3.8%. Of the original 50 identified in the random sampling 7 had moved and 1 declined the interview.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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.

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