

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

ILLINOIS



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-HLPE DEN (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:
Illinois State Board of Education

Address:
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Connie Wise

Telephone: 217-782-0354

Fax: 217-782-5333

e-mail: cwise@isbe.net

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Christopher A. Koch

Thursday, March 11, 2010, 4:13:42 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.

The state has signed the Memorandum of Understanding on the Common Core standards for reading/language arts and mathematics. They should be ready for adoption in 2010-2011.
--

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's assessments will be reviewed for alignment with the new standards once they are finalized and adopted.

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.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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	1,073,392		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,676		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	43,962		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	203,366		>97%
Hispanic	215,934		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	574,717		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	152,798		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	72,638		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	473,876		>97%
Migratory students	258		>97%
Male	548,452		>97%
Female	524,651		>97%
Comments: In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentages at 98.4% for Black, non-Hispanic; 98.4% for Migratory Students; and 99.0% for Male.			

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	40,320	26.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	96,012	64.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,627	9.1
Total	149,959	
Comments: Illinois does not offer alternative assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards, so Row #3 and Row #4 do not apply to Illinois.		

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	1,072,141		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,675		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	43,576		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	203,307		>97%
Hispanic	215,399		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	574,458		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	152,782		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	71,387		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	473,023		>97%
Migratory students	254	243	95.7
Male	547,814		>97%
Female	524,038		>97%
Comments: In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentages at 98.8% for Asian or Pacific Islander; 98.5% for Black, non-Hispanic; and 98.7% for Economically Disadvantaged Students.			

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	40,315	26.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	96,077	64.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,651	9.1
Total	150,043	
Comments: Illinois does not offer alternative assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards, so Row #3 and Row #4 do not apply to Illinois.		

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	448,699		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	751		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,385		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	82,562		>97%
Hispanic	85,745		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	248,119		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	62,891	60,915	96.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,035		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	186,799		>97%
Migratory students	120		>97%
Male	228,285		>97%
Female	220,300		>97%
Comments: In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentage at 98.7% for Female.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,098	24.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	39,904	65.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,913	9.7
Total	60,915	
Comments: Illinois does not offer alternative assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards, so Row #3 and Row #4 do not apply to Illinois.		

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	156,185	132,620	84.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	211	87.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,735	6,394	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	30,309	21,124	69.7
Hispanic	34,323	26,624	77.6
White, non-Hispanic	78,475	72,938	92.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,763	14,288	65.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,467	14,966	73.1
Economically disadvantaged students	75,817	57,456	75.8
Migratory students	44	35	79.6
Male	80,129	67,806	84.6
Female	76,031	64,800	85.2
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	155,788	112,137	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	184	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,619	5,768	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	30,337	17,262	56.9
Hispanic	34,034	18,688	54.9
White, non-Hispanic	78,442	65,556	83.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,780	9,376	43.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,987	8,693	43.5
Economically disadvantaged students	75,505	43,568	57.7
Migratory students	42	26	61.9
Male	79,940	54,683	68.4
Female	75,822	57,449	75.8
Comments: Illinois has calculated Children with Disabilities scoring at or above proficient at 43.0%.			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
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: Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 3 level.			

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

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	152,409	130,288	85.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	214	89.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,260	5,958	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	28,545	20,220	70.8
Hispanic	32,543	25,801	79.3
White, non-Hispanic	79,188	73,238	92.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,335	14,307	64.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,956	9,519	68.2
Economically disadvantaged students	71,879	55,027	76.6
Migratory students	39	34	87.2
Male	78,340	66,360	84.7
Female	74,048	63,912	86.3
Comments: The number in column #1 for Migratory Students (39) is correct.			

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

1.3.2.2 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	152,052	111,930	73.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	190	79.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,131	5,447	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	28,556	15,938	55.8
Hispanic	32,316	19,417	60.1
White, non-Hispanic	79,174	66,658	84.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,374	9,417	42.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,511	5,346	39.6
Economically disadvantaged students	71,584	42,479	59.3
Migratory students	39	21	53.8
Male	78,159	54,828	70.2
Female	73,871	57,092	77.3
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (39) is correct. In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentages at 53.8% for Migratory Students and 70.1% for Male.			

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	152,102	116,647	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	201	84.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,255	5,607	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	28,458	15,139	53.2
Hispanic	32,479	20,761	63.9
White, non-Hispanic	79,045	70,431	89.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,290	12,996	58.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,914	6,708	48.2
Economically disadvantaged students	71,720	44,561	62.1
Migratory students	39	26	66.7
Male	78,193	59,768	76.4
Female	73,888	56,867	77.0
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (39) is correct.			

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

Grade 5	# 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	152,789	125,602	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	181	84.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,271	5,879	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	28,836	18,934	65.7
Hispanic	32,373	24,397	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	79,835	71,843	90.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,376	12,457	55.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,010	6,407	58.2
Economically disadvantaged students	70,486	50,716	72.0
Migratory students	36	24	66.7
Male	78,193	63,405	81.1
Female	74,580	62,186	83.4
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (36) is correct. Illinois has calculated the Asian or Pacific Islander percentage of students scoring at or above proficient as 93.7%.			

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.

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

Grade 5	# 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	152,433	111,822	73.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	168	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,165	5,393	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	28,854	16,062	55.7
Hispanic	32,183	19,237	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	79,758	66,975	84.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,392	8,814	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,608	3,572	33.7
Economically disadvantaged students	70,202	41,239	58.7
Migratory students	33	16	48.5
Male	78,032	54,614	70.0
Female	74,385	57,199	76.9
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (33) is correct.			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# 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: Illinois does not administer science a assessment at the grade 5 level.			

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

Grade 6	# 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	154,377	126,987	82.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	186	81.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,329	5,954	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	29,769	19,473	65.4
Hispanic	31,721	24,061	75.8
White, non-Hispanic	81,563	73,436	90.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,224	11,650	52.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,161	5,122	55.9
Economically disadvantaged students	70,418	50,650	71.9
Migratory students	27	15	55.6
Male	79,229	63,886	80.6
Female	75,129	63,086	84.0
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (27) is correct.			

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

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

Grade 6	# 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	154,307	123,019	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	183	79.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,218	5,689	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	29,808	19,357	64.9
Hispanic	31,599	21,931	69.4
White, non-Hispanic	81,660	72,015	88.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,239	10,216	45.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,780	3,633	41.4
Economically disadvantaged students	70,306	47,844	68.0
Migratory students	25	11	44.0
Male	79,212	60,719	76.6
Female	75,075	62,286	83.0
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (25) is correct.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# 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: Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 6 level.			

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

Grade 7	# 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	155,215	128,218	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	250	214	85.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,205	5,848	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	30,019	19,427	64.7
Hispanic	31,167	24,312	78.0
White, non-Hispanic	83,071	74,703	89.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,210	11,049	49.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,783	4,438	57.0
Economically disadvantaged students	68,584	49,640	72.4
Migratory students	43	30	69.8
Male	79,561	64,173	80.7
Female	75,621	64,026	84.7
Comments: The number in column #1 for Migratory Students (43) is correct. In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentages at 94.2% for Asian or Pacific Islander and 49.7% for Children with Disabilities.			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who 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	154,909	119,764	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	249	199	79.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,098	5,490	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	30,040	18,964	63.1
Hispanic	30,986	20,679	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	83,027	70,875	85.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,212	9,043	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,382	2,529	34.3
Economically disadvantaged students	68,335	44,488	65.1
Migratory students	39	21	53.8
Male	79,395	58,069	73.1
Female	75,482	61,676	81.7
Comments: The number in column #1 for Migratory Students (39) is correct. In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentage at 53.8% for Migratory Students.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who 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	154,627	122,711	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	249	205	82.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,190	5,667	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	29,837	17,775	59.6
Hispanic	31,089	21,060	67.7
White, non-Hispanic	82,783	74,375	89.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,099	11,361	51.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,772	3,086	39.7
Economically disadvantaged students	68,265	45,060	66.0
Migratory students	42	27	64.3
Male	79,233	62,613	79.0
Female	75,361	60,076	79.7
Comments: The number in column #1 for Migratory Students (42) is correct. The percentages in Column #3 for Economically Disadvantaged Students (66.0) and Migratory Students (64.3) are correct.			

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

Grade 8	# 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	158,026	128,875	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	195	81.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,169	5,772	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	30,873	19,650	63.6
Hispanic	31,119	23,728	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	85,425	76,117	89.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,509	10,529	46.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,689	3,644	54.5
Economically disadvantaged students	68,411	48,301	70.6
Migratory students	29	16	55.2
Male	80,769	64,865	80.3
Female	77,244	64,008	82.9
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (29) is correct. In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentages at 63.6% for Black, non-Hispanic and 76.2% for Hispanic.			

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.

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

Grade 8	# 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	157,697	131,576	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	195	81.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,039	5,629	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	30,903	21,828	70.6
Hispanic	30,947	23,914	77.3
White, non-Hispanic	85,379	76,501	89.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,532	10,842	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,321	2,965	46.9
Economically disadvantaged students	68,161	50,120	73.5
Migratory students	29	16	55.2
Male	80,588	64,666	80.2
Female	77,097	66,907	86.8
Comments: The number in Column #1 for Migratory Students (29) is correct.			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# 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: Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 8 level.			

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	135,333	70,250	51.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	123	48.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,817	4,407	75.8
Black, non-Hispanic	21,860	4,310	19.7
Hispanic	20,726	6,657	32.1
White, non-Hispanic	83,933	53,349	63.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,542	3,140	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,974	554	18.6
Economically disadvantaged students	43,030	11,722	27.2
Migratory students	36	N<10	
Male	67,000	36,551	54.6
Female	68,310	33,692	49.3
Comments: The percentage in Column #3 for Migratory Students (8.3) is correct. In Column #3, Illinois has calculated the percentage at 48.0% for American Indian or Alaska Native.			

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.

1.3.2.7 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	135,258	77,238	57.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	156	60.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,803	3,988	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	21,854	6,325	28.9
Hispanic	20,705	7,636	36.9
White, non-Hispanic	83,900	57,482	68.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,514	3,811	23.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,941	270	9.2
Economically disadvantaged students	42,995	14,652	34.1
Migratory students	36	10	27.8
Male	66,956	36,719	54.8
Female	68,279	40,512	59.3
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

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	135,300	68,767	50.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	136	53.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,818	3,941	67.7
Black, non-Hispanic	21,839	4,048	18.5
Hispanic	20,729	5,855	28.2
White, non-Hispanic	83,918	53,360	63.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,526	3,494	21.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,978	277	9.3
Economically disadvantaged students	43,007	10,736	25.0
Migratory students	36	N<10	
Male	66,983	36,394	54.3
Female	68,294	32,366	47.4
Comments: The percentage in Column #3 for Migratory Students (5.6) is correct.			

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	3,806	2,253	59.2
Districts	869	440	50.6
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 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	2,272	1,269	55.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,062	378	35.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,210	891	73.6
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 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
795	391	49.2
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 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 Year 1, School Improvement Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under 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	4
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	6
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	6
Comments:	

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)	6
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	2
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	37
Comments: Row #2 and Row #4 in Table 1.4.4.4 should be 0.	

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.

Many high schools in restructuring have been shifting the organizational structures of their schools and using staff to focus on learning. In large schools, the school typically moves to operating as smaller learning communities. The school schedule is becoming more flexible to ensure that students are provided with multiple opportunities for achievement, meaning that the school day is often extended and that school staff duties have been changed to enable more opportunities for tutoring and extended student time with instructional staff that is focused on achievement. Many of the restructuring schools are shifting to co-teaching for students with disabilities to ensure more equitable access to the general education curriculum. Across the board, the restructuring schools are becoming more purposeful in collecting and using data and in building-shared responsibility for learning with learning communities at grades, for teams, and in learning areas. The high schools are eliminating lower level course offerings, particularly in math, and providing supports for students to ensure that they will be able to meet the requirements. These staff members are paying greater attention to low achievement early on. In addition, the high school districts are stepping up efforts to work collaboratively with feeder districts and providing transitions for students to high school.

Many districts are taking corrective action and restructuring actions before being required to do so. The table summarizes those actions taken in 2008-2009 as reported in the current, local board-approved improvement and restructuring plans submitted to the Interactive Illinois Report Card site. This means that the number of options will not necessarily equal the number of schools in Illinois that entered corrective action. Also, the districts that plan for restructuring follow through to implementation even in the cases where the school makes adequate yearly progress. District and school staff members routinely indicate that the restructuring actions selected are the most reasonable next steps in improvement for their students and that the NCLB requirements are not the only impetus for taking these actions.

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.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois State Board of Education has established a system of support for school districts that do not make adequate yearly progress. If a school district does not make AYP for two consecutive years it is required to develop a district improvement plan to assist the district to make AYP. The plan must include an objective established for each area in which the district is not making AYP. A Regional System of Support Providers (RESPRO) team is assigned to work with the school district to develop and implement the district improvement plan.

School districts in corrective action must have a current, locally approved district improvement plan submitted for review by the Illinois State Board of Education that must include implementation plans for one of the required steps identified in NCLB, Section 1116. In most cases, this results in the school district ensuring implementation of a new curriculum, with access for all students in the district. Year 1 and Year 2 school districts participate in a telephone conference with the Illinois State Board of Education to explain how the district is going to work toward making AYP or showing marked improvement. Although this is not the only sanction to be imposed by the Illinois State Board of Education, it is the one that is most often chosen. The RESPRO team works with the school district until AYP is made for two consecutive years. The Illinois State Board of Education conducts onsite monitoring visits for some Year 2 districts in conjunction with the monitoring of School Improvement Grants using 1003(g) funds.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	16
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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	8	0
Schools	8	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	12/17/09
---	----------

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	7,769	7,886
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	4,492	4,560
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	57.8	57.8
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	7,781	7,894
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	4,298	4,249
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	55.2	53.8

Comments: The data entered in the 1.4.8.1 table include information for Section 1003(g) funds ONLY, which are distributed to Illinois schools in improvement status. In Illinois, Section 1003(a) funds are distributed to the Regional System of Support, which provides assistance to schools in improvement status. As a result, the EDEN files used to populate this table do not include any Section 1003(a) data. The following information is a combination of Section 1003(a) AND 1003(g) fund data: Math SY 2008-09 # students who completed the math assessment = 270,768 # students who were proficient or above in math = 172,632 % students who were proficient or above in math = 63.8 Math SY 2007-08 # students who completed the math assessment = 276,310 # students who were proficient or above in math = 172,030 % students who were proficient or above in math = 62.3 Reading SY 2008-09 # students who completed the reading assessment = 269,858 # students who were proficient or above in reading = 161,235 % students who were proficient or above in reading = 59.7

Reading SY 2007-08 # students who completed the reading assessment = 276,310 # students who were proficient or above in reading = 172,030 % students who were proficient or above in reading = 62.3

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	
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	0
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	23
<p>Comments: In Table 1.4.8.2, the number of schools receiving assistance through SECTION 1003(G) ONLY that made AYP should be 0. The data entered in the 1.4.8.2 table include information for Section 1003(g) funds ONLY, which are distributed to Illinois schools in improvement status. In Illinois, Section 1003(a) funds are distributed to the Regional System of Support, which provides assistance to schools in improvement status. As a result, the EDEN files used to populate this table do not include any Section 1003(a) data. The following information is a combination of Section 1003(a) AND 1003(g) fund data: # schools receiving assistance that made AYP = 73 # schools receiving assistance that exited improvement status = 31 # schools receiving assistance that did NOT make AYP = 627</p>	

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

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
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	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	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
5	Strategies provided to schools included planning, training, coaching, mentoring, & monitoring. All system of support schools (outside Chicago School District 299) were served by a partnership that also included the SEA & LEAs. With data analysis and improvement planning as the core, consultants customized service to develop the capacity of the LEA and school, focused on strategies to change instructional practices related to adequate yearly progress, & implemented other statewide strategies.	359	0	47	A	no response
5	The City of Chicago School District 299 has used several strategies with the schools in the system of support, which include literacy and math initiatives and high school transformation. The City of Chicago School District 299 has also partnered with other entities to deliver technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.	335	0	26	A	no response

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.

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois State Board of Education staff have shared "tips" for planning at statewide and area conferences through the work of the RESPRO consultant network. Illinois State Board of Education staff meets monthly with the key contacts for the RESPRO areas and the three statewide associations that are included in the RESPRO System of Support. Following these meetings, the area RESPROs meet with the consultants working in the field with the schools and districts. In addition, the Illinois State Board of Education showcases districts and schools at these conferences and meetings in order to share best practices.

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:

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

SY 2008-2009 was the first year of funding Section 1003(g) projects in Illinois. The competitive grant process was initiated on June 9, 2008, and the funding period was July 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009.

Beginning June 2008, ISBE provided training and monthly updates on the School Improvement Plan 1003(g) grant at the monthly meeting/training sessions for the statewide Regional System of Support Providers (RESPRO) members. The RESPRO consultants provide the ongoing individualized support for the Title I LEAs with the lowest achieving schools, and for the lowest achieving schools themselves. The consultants provide technical assistance, as needed, to ensure that the schools meet their goals according to the school and LEA improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans required under Section 1116. This includes working with the schools and LEAs to develop plans that meet the federal requirements; providing training for leadership and staff in areas of need, as defined by the plans; and providing resources and assistance with development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan 1003(g) grant projects.

Each of the 23 awarded projects, all located in the 10 Illinois RESPRO areas, received a comprehensive FY09 School Improvement Plan 1003(g) Resource Manual, participated in statewide teleconferences, and, upon request, were provided with individualized technical assistance by an Illinois State Board of Education staff member. Presentations on the School Improvement Plan 1003(g) project expectations were included in the fall and spring Title I Directors Conferences in Springfield, Illinois; the NCLB FY09 Conference in Chicago; and the Committee of Practitioners sessions.

Evaluations were conducted via onsite technical assistance visits by the RESPROs, which included completion of the RESPRO monitoring tool to detail the services, outcomes of the session, and plans for next steps. A formal evaluation of the School Improvement Plan 1003(g) projects was conducted in June 2009 by a team of six Illinois State Board of Education administrators and other staff members. The team monitored project implementation at each school to ensure fidelity to the proposal as submitted. The process included the completion of the FY09 Self-Monitoring Questionnaire, which aligns with the FY09 School Improvement Plan 1003(g) grant and required the awarded LEA and school to provide responses and cite evidence/documentation for each of the 16 items that align with Section 1003 (g) and project goals. Prior to meeting with each funded school, the team members reviewed the FY08 school report card and adequate yearly progress status, FY08 school improvement plan, School Improvement Plan 1003(g) fiscal reports, and the completed FY09 Self-Monitoring Questionnaire. If the questionnaire was incomplete, a school was required to refine and resubmit. Based on the responses and review of a school's academic status documents, conferences were held via telephone or onsite. Each team member filed a report on their findings and the results will be used as part of the FY10 onsite monitoring reviews.

In September 2009, the 23 FY09 School Improvement Plan 1003(g) projects filed FY09 School Improvement Plan 1003(g) Progress Reports that identified their effective U.S. Department of Education required strategies and positive outcomes. The reports included analyses of their FY09 state assessment results and local data to substantiate indication of academic gains related to the comparison of their FY08 and FY09 improvement status, making adequate yearly progress, and other positive outcomes, including increased teacher retention and increased parental involvement.

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 primary vehicle for providing support to Title I schools identified for improvement is the Regional System of Support, which receives the majority of funding through 1003(a) to provide technical assistance to LEAs and schools in academic status. The Illinois State Board of Education uses other available federal (such as Title II and Title IV) and state funds to provide technical assistance to Title I schools that have been identified for improvement. Technical assistance includes assisting with development of improvement and restructuring plans and overseeing review of the plans, including written feedback.

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	51,713
Applied to transfer	2,486
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	633

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	\$ 4,779,964

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	94

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.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	297,342
Applied for supplemental educational services	79,613
Received supplemental educational services	65,983
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 85,323,416
Comments:	

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	157,065	155,166	98.8	1,899	1.2
All elementary classes	118,048	117,091	99.2	957	0.8
All secondary classes	39,017	38,075	97.6	942	2.4

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

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

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For grades K-5, a classroom is counted as a full-day, self-contained classroom and equals one class.

Grades 6-8 classrooms may be counted as a full-day, self-contained classroom that equals one class, OR may be counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

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
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	54.4
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	18.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	15.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other:

Elementary ELL teachers enrolled in an approved program while teaching.

Teachers who hold a Type 29 certificate.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	47.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	13.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	18.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other:

ELL teachers enrolled in an approved program while teaching.

Teachers who hold a Type 29 certificate.

Special education teachers who have a temporary certificate.

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	22,371	21,690	97.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	38,625	38,582	99.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	10,259	9,478	92.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	13,058	13,045	99.9

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	69.1	19.2
Poverty metric used	Resubmitted EDEN files did not correctly populate Table 1.5.3. The correct numbers for the first four rows of Table 1.5.3 are: High-poverty Elem Schools--22,113 // 21,454 // 97.0% Low-poverty Elem Schools--38,526 // 38,483 // 99.9% (same as on table) High-poverty Sec Schools--9,980 // 9,247 // 92.7% Low-Poverty Sec Schools--13,050 // 13,037 // 99.9% (same as on table) Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are the lowest 25 percent. Low-poverty schools are the highest 25 percent.	
Secondary schools	49.4	17.3
Poverty metric used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are the lowest 25 percent. Low-poverty schools are the highest 25 percent.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.*
- b. *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.*
- c. *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.*
- d. *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.**
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, Polish, Arabic, Chinese
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Languages-

Sheltered English instruction: Spanish Structured English immersion: Spanish Content-based ESL: Spanish Pull-out ESL: Spanish

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	208,839
Comments:	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	179,092
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	166,451
Polish	7,111
Arabic	4,114
Urdu	2,801
Chinese	2,790

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	150,993
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	49,162
Total	200,155
<p>Comments: EDEN file N141 reports the unduplicated number of all LEP students in the state during the school year as 208,839. EDEN file N137 reports the unduplicated number of LEP students who were enrolled AT THE TIME of the state annual English language proficiency assessment as 200,155. The difference between the total number of LEP students enrolled during the school year and the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing is 8,684 students who were not enrolled at the time of testing. The number tested should be compared with the number enrolled at the time of testing, and not with the total enrollment for the entire school year. The total number of ALL LEP students NOT tested on the state annual ELP assessment is 49,162. Per the instructions for this table to use the definition of "all LEP students" as defined in 1.6.2.1, which states, "include...newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program," this number includes 8,116 LEP students NOT enrolled in a Title III program and 41,046 LEP students enrolled in a Title III program. Counting an LEP student as Title III is based on receipt of Title III funds by the LEA, i.e., all LEP students enrolled in LEAs that received Title III funds are counted as Title III students. Reasons provided by LEAs for students not being tested on the state annual ELP assessment were: 1. Erroneously marked LEP = 40,376 2. Parents refused/withdrew services = 2,628 3. Disability = 2,522 4. Not tested and should have been = 1,746 5. Have records in the 2009 ACCESS (state annual ELP assessment) = 5 6. Never enrolled in program (not monitored for testing) = 522 7. Other (absent, medical, alternative placement, moved, dropped out, transferred, graduated) = 1,363</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	49,486
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	32.8
Comments:	

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	133,916
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	41,046
Total	174,962

Comments: EDEN file N116 reports the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction education program in grades K through 12 during the school year as 179,092. EDEN file N138 reports the unduplicated number of students who participated in an English language instruction education program, under Title III of ESEA as amended by NCLB, AT THE TIME of the state annual English language proficiency assessment, as 174,962. The difference between the number of LEP students who received Title III language instruction service during the school year and the number of students who participated in a Title III language instruction program at the time of testing is 4,130 students who were not participating in Title III language instruction programs at the time of testing. The number tested can be compared only with the number participating in a program at the time of testing, and not with the number participating over the course of the entire school year. The total number of LEP students enrolled in a Title III program who were NOT tested on the state annual ELP assessment is 41,046 LEP students. Counting an LEP student as Title III is based on receipt of Title III funds by the LEA, i.e., all LEP students enrolled in LEAs that received Title III funds are counted as Title III students. Reasons provided by LEAs for students not being tested on the state annual ELP assessment include: 1. Erroneously marked LEP = 35,253 2. Parents refused/withdrew services = 143 3. Disability = 2,421 4. Not tested and should have been = 1,717 5. Have records in the 2009 ACCESS (state annual ELP assessment) = 3 6. Never enrolled in program (not monitored for testing) = 447 7. Other (absent, medical, alternative placement, moved, dropped out, transferred, graduated) = 1,062

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.	36,455

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	91,578	68.3	0	85.00
ELP attainment	37,142	27.7	0	10.00

Comments: The number column under Targets is not applicable. The percentage of students making progress should be 94.0 percent rather than the 68.3 percent indicated above, based on: 1. The total number of students who received title III services and took the ACCESS test in 2009 is 133,916 (See 1.6.3.2.1 above). 2. Of these 133,916 students, 36,455 had only one data point, i.e., they took the test for the first time. (See 1.6.3.2.1 above).

1. The total number of students who took the test minus the number of first-time test takers equals the number of students for which progress can be determined: $133,916 - 36,455 = 97,461$. This provides a valid denominator to determine the percentage of Title III LEP students making progress, i.e., all students with two data points. The 36,455 students who took the test for the first time should not be included in the equation because there is no second-year data available from which to determine whether progress has been made.
2. The equation should divide the number of students who made progress by the total number of students with two data points: $91,578 / 97,461 \times 100 = 94.0\%$.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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)
NA
Comments: This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language mathematics assessments.

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)
NA
Comments: This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language reading/language arts assessments.

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)
NA
Comments: This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language science assessments.

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
13,909	11,943	25,852
Comments:		

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
25,714	21,838	84.9	3,876
Comments:			

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
25,736	19,120	74.3	6,616
Comments:			

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
9,567	6,849	71.6	2,718
Comments:			

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	195
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	103
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	194
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	193
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	78
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	43
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	9
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	3
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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
31,330	10,041	53

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.	3,847
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	3,158

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **#Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	187	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	98	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	126	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	105	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	50	
Other (Explain in comment box)	118	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	171	14,424
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	187	4,889
PD provided to principals	148	1,341
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	145	660
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	37	1,819
PD provided to community based organization personnel	37	477
Total	725	23,610

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other--Teacher education programs to assist personnel in meeting certification requirements.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	10/01/08	90
Comments:		

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

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

The Illinois State Board of Education will move from a paper application system to an electronic grant management system (eGMS) for FY11, effective January 1, 2010, which will enable the SEA to manage the application process in a more systematic and timely manner. The eGMS will reduce paperwork, allow for electronic notification of grant approval, and expedite the distribution of Title III funds to school districts.

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	
Comments: Although ISBE submitted EDEN file N130, this table was not populated. The number that should appear here is 0.	

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	86.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	75.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	74.9
Hispanic	75.7
White, non-Hispanic	92.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	81.2
Limited English proficient	57.2
Economically disadvantaged	78.2
Migratory students	36.4
Male	84.2
Female	88.8
Comments: The graduation rates for limited English proficient and migratory students are correct as reported.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9.0
Hispanic	7.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.0
Limited English proficient	8.2
Economically disadvantaged	4.4
Migratory students	11.1
Male	4.9
Female	3.8
Comments: The dropout rate for Migratory Students is correct as reported.	

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	862	862
LEAs with subgrants	0	0
Total	862	862
Comments: Illinois uses a regional service system for subgrants. Funding is awarded through seven area regions.		

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)	496	
K	614	
1	607	
2	573	
3	539	
4	489	
5	465	
6	395	
7	455	
8	448	
9	408	
10	351	
11	361	
12	453	
Ungraded		
Total	6,654	
Comments: Column #3 is not applicable, as Illinois is a regional service state. Subgrants are made to regional service centers, not to public schools.		

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	876	
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,711	
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	125	
Hotels/Motels	438	
Total	6,150	
Comments: The data collection tool use has high incidence of input errors, allowing for inconsistency in the data for 1.9.1.1 and 1.9.1.2. Beginning with SY 2009-10, the data collection will be linked to each student's unique identifier.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,284
K	1,996
1	2,104
2	2,032
3	2,193
4	1,861
5	1,840
6	1,715
7	1,731
8	1,752
9	2,295
10	2,114
11	1,647
12	1,896
Ungraded	
Total	26,460
Comments:	

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	536
Migratory children/youth	76
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,003
Limited English proficient students	1,188
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	1,323
Expedited evaluations	370
Staff professional development and awareness	1,056
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	1,028
Transportation	2,992
Early childhood programs	390
Assistance with participation in school programs	1,061
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1,093
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	1,192
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2,489
Coordination between schools and agencies	2,053
Counseling	1,478
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	207
Clothing to meet a school requirement	1,415
School supplies	3,157
Referral to other programs and services	1,775
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	302
Other (optional – in comment box below)	498
Other (optional – in comment box below)	283
Other (optional – in comment box below)	34

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois is a regional service state. Subgrants are made to regional service centers, not to public schools. The individual school data provided here are collected from the schools--although they do not directly receive subgrant funds.

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	716
School Selection	259
Transportation	751
School records	301
Immunizations	268
Other medical records	82
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois is a regional service state. Subgrants are made to regional service centers, not to public schools. The individual school data provided here are collected from the schools--although they do not directly receive subgrant funds.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State ESEA reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,806	900
4	1,556	750
5	1,563	764
6	1,454	881
7	1,428	812
8	1,468	968
High School	1,152	298
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,814	1,167
4	1,562	1,035
5	1,566	968
6	1,454	872
7	1,429	859
8	1,474	862
High School	1,155	195
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	274
K	132
1	137
2	112
3	127
4	99
5	101
6	101
7	113
8	117
9	134
10	107
11	97
12	41
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	302
Total	1,994
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 1 is somewhat higher than the count reported last year. In summer 2009, state and local recruiters canvassed areas of Illinois known to have large concentrations of migrant families, as well as those areas where small numbers of migrant children may be found. Eligible migrant children and youth were identified in several communities where none had been identified during the previous year. Recruiters also strengthened relationships with partner agencies throughout the state to better serve migrant farm workers in Illinois.

Illinois is one of 15 states that form the Out-of-School Youth (OSY) Migrant Education Incentive Grant Consortium. As part of Illinois's participation in the OSY Consortium, recruiters adapted their outreach efforts to identify out-of-school youth, a population that has often been difficult to reach. Working more closely with partner agencies was particularly helpful in reaching out to the OSY population. As a result, the number of out-of-school youth recruited in FY09 is more than 60 percent higher than the number recruited in FY08.

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).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	92
K	86
1	77
2	69
3	91
4	61
5	53
6	58
7	50
8	43
9	48
10	37
11	34
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	103
Total	907
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 2 is more than 10 percent higher than the number reported last year. During summer 2009 the Illinois Migrant Education Program recruited more out-of-school youth than in previous years, and local projects created learning opportunities and services tailored to the unique characteristics of out-of-school youth, including English as a second language classes and life skills lessons. In 2009, 103 out-of-school youth participated in summer programs, while only 9 out-of-school youth participants were reported in 2008.

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.

Illinois used the New Generation System (NGS) to compile and generate the Category 1 and the Category 2 child counts for the 2008-2009 reporting period. NGS was also used to produce the child counts for the previous reporting period.

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.

The Category 1 and Category 2 counts include only migrant children and youth with completed Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) and Supplemental Documentation. The eligibility of each child and youth counted was documented with a current, valid COE and Supplemental Documentation form on file at the local level, with an approved copy of the COE located at the statewide records office.

Local recruiters, employed by the local MEP projects, conducted face-to-face interviews with families to identify migrant children. The Illinois Migrant Council coordinated recruiting efforts at the state level and conducted recruiting and completed COEs in areas of the state that local recruiters did not reach.

The activities conducted to collect the COE data followed the guidelines included in the Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual (http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/htmls/migrant_resources.htm). All COEs were prepared by certified migrant recruiters who had successfully completed the required annual state training. The signature of the parent/guardian or unaccompanied youth interviewed was required on the COE. Each COE was reviewed and approved at the local and state levels. Any questionable items on the COE were sent back to the local project for correction. Illinois uses a three-year COE, on which continued residency is recorded during annual residency verification efforts. A new COE was completed for each migrant family that made a new, qualifying move.

The Category 2 child count includes only children who were served for one or more days in MEP-funded summer programs in Illinois. Local projects maintained records of individual student enrollment, attendance, and services. Based on their records, local projects indicated participation in the MEP-funded summer program for each eligible migrant student entered in NGS. Average daily attendance figures are submitted each year as part of the application for MEP funds.

The following data are collected for each child included in the count:

*Demographic information, including names of parents, address, telephone number, and the names and birth dates of children/youths.

*Specific eligibility criteria, including 1) residency date; 2) qualifying arrival date; 3) city/state moved from and city/state moved to; 4) whether the children moved with or to join a parent, guardian, or spouse, or on their own; 5) whether the move was to enable them to

obtain or seek temporary or seasonal employment in fishing or agricultural work; 6) a description of the qualifying activity; 7) whether the move was due to economic necessity; 8) whether the child's schooling was interrupted; and 9) documentation of residency in the state during the year.

*Program participation data, such as enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, and available academic and health information are collected by local migrant project staff and entered into the NGS migrant student database.

*Confirmation data, including the signatures of the recruiter, the family member interviewed, the local reviewer, and the state reviewer.

Recruiters completed COEs on a daily basis and brought them to their project offices. Trained NGS data entry specialists entered student enrollment and participation information into NGS, a centralized database in accordance with the state requirements and timelines specified in Illinois Migrant Education Program Requirements and Timelines: NGS and Identification and Recruitment Data Flow. Illinois requirements stipulate that information be entered into NGS within five working days of COE completion.

Residency verification was conducted between September 1 and October 31 to update information for migrant children and youth with COEs, documenting eligibility during the previous year. The verification information was entered into the NGS history line, reflecting the appropriate reporting period for each eligible migrant.

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.

Child count data were entered into NGS by local project staff. The statewide records office was responsible for managing the COE verification and NGS data entry for the state to ensure the accuracy and consistency of child eligibility determinations and the data collected.

Trained recruiters completed paper COEs by hand. Trained data entry specialists entered the migrant child information from the COE or Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet into NGS at the local project site. For each newly identified migrant child, the local project contacted the statewide records office to request a unique student identifier. The statewide records office verified that the student had not already been entered into NGS before issuing a unique student identifier and giving the local project staff permission to enter the student's information into NGS.

Local projects sent copies of completed documentation to the statewide records office, where staff compared COEs and NGS entries for all local projects to ensure that the data entered matched the information on the COE. They sent local projects reports of any discrepancies to be corrected. When local school MEP personnel could not input student data, the state records office provided data-entry assistance. At the end of the local program grant period, a final review identified any remaining discrepancies to be resolved.

NGS allows for multiple enrollment data entry. However, prior to data entry for each student, residency was verified through the COE and enrollment information updated on the Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet.

For each new or updated COE, NGS created a history line that was coded to identify eligible children to be included in the Category 1 count. A history line was created for each child enrolled in summer school to be included in the Category 2 count. NGS assigned a unique student identifier to each child so that an unduplicated count could be produced.

The statewide records office distributed reports of data entered into NGS to local projects for review. Local projects also generated their own NGS reports to ensure accuracy and to eliminate any duplication.

Illinois established a deadline for entering and cleaning all data for the reporting year into the system. After all data were entered, NGS produced a snapshot of the data for the reporting year. The state checked the data for errors before submitting the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts to the Office of Migrant Education in the Consolidated State Performance Report.

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.

Information for the Category 1 and Category 2 counts was collected and maintained following the procedures described in this section.

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.

NGS programming uses the eligibility information entered for each child to generate an unduplicated child count report, which includes only eligible migrant children ages 3-21, based on federal requirements, for at least one day during the counting period of 9/1/2008-8/31/2009.

1. Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were between 3-21 years of age, were within three years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)

The NGS query is programmed to include only children who were at least 3 and less than 22 years of age who had eligibility for at least one day during the period 9/1/08-8/31/2009. Recruiters verify birth dates, the date of the last qualifying move, and the qualifying activity during initial interviews with families; this information is entered into NGS. Recruiters use an NGS report to track two-year-olds about to turn three and schedule visits with families to verify residency and enroll three-year-olds into programs. NGS will count only those three-year-olds who were actually in residence in the state on or after their third birthday.

2. Children who were resident in the state for at least one day during the eligible period

Record updates are conducted to verify continuing residency for all children identified in a previous year. Illinois uses school/program attendance records or information obtained during a home visit to confirm residency. Less frequently, a telephone conversation with the family may be used to confirm continued residency after the initial COE has been completed. The residency verification date is entered into NGS. The NGS query is programmed to count only children verified to be a resident in Illinois for at least one day during their eligibility period. NGS creates history lines with specific enrollment type flags for each new or updated COE for the count. Enrollment and withdrawal dates must be entered for every student included in the summer count.

3. Children who received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term

For the Category 2 count, the NGS query is programmed to include only eligible children who received MEP-funded services under a summer enrollment flag of "S." A summer enrollment is entered only after the student enrolls AND participates in an MEP-funded summer program, as documented in local project records. Summer migrant programs operate during the months of June, July, and, less frequently, August.

2 Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category

NGS is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. Each student has a unique student identification number that is entered into NGS. In Illinois, the statewide records office assigns unique student identification numbers to newly identified migrant children to ensure that a check for duplicates is performed before a new student record is created. The system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields, such as first name, birth date, and parents' names. To generate the unduplicated count, data are consolidated, duplicates are removed, and students are sorted by current age for children not yet in kindergarten and by grade for K-12 students, based on the information entered into the student record in NGS.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 and the Category 2 counts were generated using NGS.

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.

Illinois implemented quality control mechanisms for migrant child recruiting at the state and local levels. The Illinois Migrant Service Delivery Plan specifies the components of the state quality control efforts and the Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual provides the guide for implementation.

The state annually reviews the quality control efforts and modifies activities to address any issues identified during the previous year.

In FY09 the Illinois MEP program conducted the following activities

***Recruiter Training, Technical Assistance, and Review:** All recruiters participated in the mandatory annual Illinois MEP two-day Identification and Recruitment training session to become authorized to complete COEs. Training emphasized eligibility determinations, documentation, quality control techniques, recruiting strategies, and programmatic and policy updates. A make-up training session was held for those unable to attend the original Identification and Recruitment training. Additional training was offered at the Statewide MEP Workshop in June. All recruiters received a copy of the updated Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual, which is also available online. The state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator provided ongoing technical assistance and support throughout the year by telephone, e-mail, and in person. He also hosted an online, professional networking site for recruiters and other migrant program staff to exchange ideas and ask questions. He visited local projects, reviewed their recruiting practices and documentation, and, in some instances, conducted joint recruiting with staff during the summer. The state records office identified local projects in need of additional technical assistance based on the quality of their COEs submitted for approval.

***Proper Eligibility Determinations and Documentation Quality Controls:** Recruiters interviewed families and verified all eligibility information before student data were entered into NGS. Recruiters maintained documentation to back up their recruiting activity and decisions, including 1) a supplemental documentation form that requires additional information to support decisions about Intent-to-Seek Moves, Temporary Work Status, Economic Necessity, and Interrupted Schooling, and 2) a recruiter's log. Recruiters used a COE review checklist to review the COE for completeness and accuracy. The trained local project COE reviewer checked each COE for accuracy. Each COE was signed by the recruiter, as well as by the parent, guardian, or self-eligible youth interviewed and the local project reviewer. NGS data entry specialists were provided training to enable them to conduct an initial review of all COEs as they prepared for entering COE data into NGS.

Following state NGS implementation guidelines, local projects sent the completed COEs promptly to the statewide records office for review. The statewide records office contacted the local program to resolve any questions. The designated SEA reviewer approved all COEs of children to be included in the child count. If the eligibility status could not be resolved, SEA staff reviewed the COE to make an eligibility determination.

***State and Local Random COE Checks:** The state required each MEP-funded local project to develop a local quality control plan that included a systematic, random check of COEs. A trained individual who did not make the initial eligibility determination reviewed the COE document to determine its face validity and conducted an interview with the family to verify all eligibility information recorded following a set protocol that contains all items used in the original eligibility determination. Local projects reported the results of their quality control reviews to the State Identification and Recruitment coordinator.

The State Identification and Recruitment coordinator also conducted re-interviews of migrant families across the state, chosen through a random selection process. Re-interviewers were individuals familiar with the migrant community, but not directly associated with the local project that initially determined MEP-eligibility. Re-interviewers received training to follow an established protocol to ensure that they asked stipulated questions that covered all required eligibility criteria in a face-to-face meeting with families or by telephone. A committee of reviewers determined whether the information gathered confirmed the child's eligibility. Any children determined to be ineligible were removed from the NGS data and not included in the child count.

***Monitoring:** The Identification and Recruitment coordinator examined COEs and eligibility documentation and procedures during onsite visits to local projects. Review of eligibility documentation was also included in the SEA monitoring of local projects.

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 Illinois MEP Quality Control Plan is designed to strengthen and maintain the accuracy of the state's Identification and Recruitment processes through use of a variety of checks and balances, including validations of child eligibility determinations involving re-interviews of families previously identified. The plan, updated annually, establishes the minimum quality control requirements of all MEP Identification

and Recruitment efforts throughout the state. The plan and the Identification and Recruitment component of the Illinois MEP are managed through a contract with the Illinois Migrant Council, where the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator is employed.

The Quality Control Plan operates at the state and local levels. Each locally funded MEP is required to develop its own plan to ensure that The State Quality Control Plan requires that the eligibility of 50 children with current-year eligibility determinations be verified annually by validating each MEP eligibility criterion for every child selected. Samples are generated by randomly selecting 50 children on a statewide basis or within categories associated with identified risk factors. Eligibility verifications are divided proportionally among the state's projects and recruiters. A trained recruiter independent of the original eligibility determination conducts the validation through a re-interview. Independent re-interviews are used at least once every three years.

Aligned with the State Quality Control Plan, Local Quality Control plans require that the eligibility of 3 percent of a project's COEs completed during the current program year be verified by validating each criterion that makes children eligible for the MEP. Validations, or re-interviews, are made by a trained, bilingual recruiter independent of the original eligibility determination. Samples are generated by randomly selecting 3 percent of the project's COEs. Eligibility verifications are divided as evenly as possible among a project's recruiters.

To ensure the most complete results, re-interviews are scheduled when nearly all migrant families have been recruited for the season, and therefore are more easily accessible. High-quality, systematic data collection is ensured by using standardized documentation containing all items used in the original eligibility determination for all interviews throughout the state. All re-interviewers received training from the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. Comprehensive support is available to those involved in the re-interview process at any point along the way.

The State Identification and Recruitment coordinator monitors the re-interview process on an ongoing basis. State and local interview results are submitted for review, with final eligibility determinations made by a review committee. Any inaccuracies detected by quality control measures are appropriately resolved in a timely manner. In addition, all results are entered into a statewide database maintained by the state Identification and Recruitment coordinator. The re-interview process is continually assessed and any needed changes to improve the process are implemented promptly.

Children determined to be ineligible were removed from the NGS data and not included in the child count. Local projects were informed of any ineligible children identified, and they, in turn, communicated this decision to the families affected.

Summary of State and Local Quality Control Results-Total Children Represented by Interviews: 206 Total Eligible Children Represented by Interviews (%): 202 (98.06%)

State Results-Target Children in Sample: 51 reviewed/50 (98.04%) eligibility confirmed Siblings of Target Children in Sample: 74 reviewed/71 (95.95%) eligibility confirmed Total Children in Sample: 125 reviewed/121 (96.80%) eligibility confirmed

Local Results-# COEs Examined: 39 (100%) # Eligible COEs: 39 # Children Represented by Interviews: 81 # Eligible Children Represented by Interviews: 81 (100%)

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.

NGS data entry specialists receive annual training at the Statewide Migrant Education Workshop and individual technical assistance throughout the year. The Illinois Migrant Council statewide migrant records office staff distributes a data entry manual to all local projects and responds to questions by telephone and e-mail throughout the year.

The statewide migrant records office manages the NGS data system and controls the entry of newly identified migrant children into it. Before issuing a unique student identifier to allow the local project staff to enter a child's information, the statewide migrant records office confirms that the child is not already included in the system. They review the NGS data entered by local projects to ensure that the NGS record matches the information collected on the COE and then send reports of discrepancies to all migrant-funded sites. Sites use this information to verify migrant student data against COEs on file and to assess identification and recruitment procedures. The Illinois Migrant Council uses these reports to provide technical assistance and design follow-up training. The SEA uses these reports to monitor child counts and the provision of services to eligible children by local MEP-funded projects.

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.

To verify the accuracy of the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts the statewide migrant records office and the SEA conduct ongoing substantiation of data by running preliminary federal report data, including the aggregate counts, as well as the list of the individual migrant children included in the counts, and checking these reports for inconsistencies or inaccuracies. To address any discrepancies, staff may consult source documents, including the COEs, and contact local projects to provide any additional information needed to correct the NGS

data.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New developments and areas of concern identified through re-interview results, along with recruiter questions, onsite technical assistance findings, and feedback and updates from the Office of Migrant Education, will be used to develop the recruiter training curriculum for 2010. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator will work onsite with the LEA that completed the incorrect COE, as identified through the re-interview process, to improve their quality control process and prevent errors in identification. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator attended the National Identification and Recruitment Forum in fall 2008 to attend Office of Migrant Education policy presentations, network with other states, and identify exemplary and innovative practices to strengthen Illinois migrant identification and recruitment efforts.

This year the Illinois MEP worked on the redesign of the state COE to incorporate the national COE requirements issued by the U.S. Department of Education on July 29, 2009. The redesigned COE was completed for implementation during the 2009-2010 school year and training was provided to local recruiters working in fall and regular year programs. The annual recruiter training for all recruiters, including those working in summer programs, will be modified to incorporate the changes reflected in the new COE.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois MEP Identification and Recruitment procedures incorporate the development of qualified, well-trained, and well-supported recruiting staff, as well as the systematic and timely review of eligibility decisions and recruiting processes at the state and local levels. The state MEP responds quickly to any emerging areas of concern by working directly with local projects to modify their procedures in order to avoid errors in eligibility determination. The annual state and local re-interview processes measure the effectiveness of these efforts and point to areas where additional training or modifications are warranted. The 2008-2009 eligibility verifications yielded a result of 98.6 percent of the children included with confirmed eligibility. The state MEP will continue to monitor and improve the controls that are in place and to update the plan as needed to maintain high-quality eligibility determinations.