

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

OKLAHOMA



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

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:

Oklahoma State Department of Education

Address:

2500 North Lincoln Blvd
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Dr. Cindy Koss

Telephone: 405-521-4514

Fax: 405-521-2971

e-mail: cindy_koss@mail.sde.state.ok.us

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

Dr. Cindy Koss

Friday, March 12, 2010, 9:04:43 AM

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.

OVERVIEW

The state of Oklahoma has had Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, and Science standards in place for grades PK-12 since 1993. The Oklahoma Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS) document is based on standards recommendations of national organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the National Council of Teachers of English, The International Reading Association, the National Research Council, and the American Diploma Project.

Revision of PASS occurs pursuant to state statute with committees composed of representatives from state teachers, curriculum specialists, university faculty in content specific areas, and professional organizations. Recommendations for revision are then sent to the State Superintendent and the Oklahoma State Board of Education for public hearings and approval before they become state law. State statute requires review of state standards prior to annual textbook adoption and as appropriate during each content area's six-year cycle.

MATHEMATICS

General mathematics knowledge in patterns and algebraic reasoning, number sense, number operations and computation, geometry, measurement, data analysis, probability, and statistics is targeted in the standards for grades 1-8, while standards for grades 9-12 are written for Algebra 1, Algebra 2, and Geometry. Mathematics process standards and content standards are addressed in separate sections of the PASS document. Process standards address problem solving, connections, representation, communication, and reasoning. Mathematics PASS had minor revisions in 2005 as well as revisions and reorganization of high school standards in 2006 and 2007. Mathematics PASS was comprehensively reviewed and revised in spring 2009. The new mathematics standards will be assessed beginning 2010.

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS

Knowledge in the areas of reading, literature, research and information, writing, grammar, usage, mechanics, oral language, listening and speaking, and visual literacy is targeted in the standards for all grades. Reading/Literature standards of Language Arts PASS underwent the six-year review cycle for revisions in 2007. The Grammar/Composition standards of Language Arts PASS are currently being reviewed and revised for adoption in spring 2010. The new standards will be assessed beginning with the 2011.

SCIENCE

General science knowledge is targeted in the standards for grades 1-8, while standards for grades 9-12 are written for Physical Science, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Science process skills and content standards are addressed in separate sections of the PASS document. Process standards address observation and measurement, classification, experimentation, interpretation and communication, modeling, and inquiry. As students apply the content knowledge through these standards and through extended experimental projects, problem-solving skills and creative thinking processes are enhanced. The six-year review cycle allows for Science PASS reviewed and revised for adoption in spring 2011. The new standards will be assessed beginning 2012.

RIGOR, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND APPROVAL

Rigor is evidenced in the various levels of thinking skills embedded in all content/process standards. In order to support teachers as they incorporate the standards in classroom curriculum, the Oklahoma State Department of Education has established PASSPORT II, an online database of interactive lessons and resources aligned to for each grade level. Assistance is also provided to teachers through State Department of Education professional development workshops, mathematics academies, reading academies, science inquiry academies, Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grants, videoconference presentations, and point-to-point videoconferences.

Oklahoma's state assessment system, including state standards, was approved through ED's peer review process in 2005-2006.

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.

Oklahoma reset achievement standards for grades 3-8 Mathematics and Reading as well as End-of-Instruction English II in June 2009. These standards as well as new Performance Level Descriptors were then adopted by the State Board of Education. Currently, all evidence has been submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for Peer Review for the November 2009 cycle.

Oklahoma reset achievement standards for its End-of-Instruction Algebra I assessment in June 2007. By law, cut scores were to be phased in. Beginning with the Winter/Trimester testing cycle in 2009, a score of 700 on the Oklahoma Performance Index will be required for a Satisfactory/Proficient performance level.

Oklahoma developed a Modified assessment and modified academic achievement standards for students with disabilities and implemented it for its first administration in Spring 2007. Currently, the state has submitted evidence for the November 2009 Peer Review for its Modified assessments in Mathematics and Reading for grades 3-8 and End-of-Instruction Algebra I and English II.

Oklahoma has submitted its alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for Peer Review for the November 2009 cycle. Assessments for Mathematics and Reading for grades 3-8 and End-of-Instruction Algebra I and English II had academic achievement standards reset in June 2009.

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.

Oklahoma reset achievement standards for End-of-Instruction Biology II in June 2009. These standards as well as new Performance Level Descriptors were then adopted by the State Board of Education. Currently, all evidence has been submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for Peer Review for the November 2009 cycle.

Oklahoma has submitted evidence for Science grades 5 and 8 for Peer Review for the November 2009 cycle.

Oklahoma developed a Modified assessment and modified academic achievement standards for students with disabilities and implemented it for its first administration in Spring 2007. Currently, the state has submitted evidence for the November 2009 Peer Review for its Modified assessments in Science for grades 5 and 8 and End-of-Instruction Biology I.

Oklahoma has submitted its alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for Peer Review for the November 2009 cycle. Alternate achievement standards for Science for grades 5 and 8 and End-of-Instruction Biology I were reset in June 2009.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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	333,747		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	61,778		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,763	6,446	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	35,931		>97%
Hispanic	34,148		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	195,127	188,223	96.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	53,239		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,851		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	171,209		>97%
Migratory students	312		>97%
Male	171,027	165,771	96.9
Female	162,279		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(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	11,230	21.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,831	22.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	24,980	48.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,880	7.5
Total	51,921	
Comments:		

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	322,572		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	60,151		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,246		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	34,868		>97%
Hispanic	32,990		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	188,317		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	52,964	51,090	96.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,648	14,991	95.8
Economically disadvantaged students	166,278		>97%
Migratory students	284		>97%
Male	165,185		>97%
Female	156,861		>97%
Comments:			

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

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

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's 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	9,098	17.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,291	24.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	25,894	50.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,807	7.4
Total	51,090	
Comments:		

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	132,460		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	24,797		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,737		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	14,152		>97%
Hispanic	13,004		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	77,770		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,462	19,528	95.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,167		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	64,672		>97%
Migratory students	109		>97%
Male	67,684		>97%
Female	64,579		>97%
Comments:			

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	4,835	24.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,512	28.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	9,181	47.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	19,528	
Comments: remove before certifying		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	48,113	31,461	65.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,926	5,711	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	943	722	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,286	2,533	47.9
Hispanic	5,595	3,106	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	27,363	19,389	70.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,749	4,125	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,865	1,960	50.7
Economically disadvantaged students	27,826	16,278	58.5
Migratory students	59	27	45.8
Male	24,669	16,583	67.2
Female	23,399	14,853	63.5
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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.

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	48,027	31,153	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,915	5,609	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	914	672	73.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,285	2,714	51.4
Hispanic	5,553	2,833	51.0
White, non-Hispanic	27,360	19,325	70.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,757	3,456	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,761	1,660	44.1
Economically disadvantaged students	27,634	15,914	57.6
Migratory students	58	24	41.4
Male	24,622	15,346	62.3
Female	23,361	15,788	67.6
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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.

1.3.1.1 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: Oklahoma does not administer a science assessment at Grade 3.			

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

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	47,232	30,975	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,855	5,528	62.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	903	713	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,121	2,510	49.0
Hispanic	5,236	2,901	55.4
White, non-Hispanic	27,117	19,323	71.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,846	3,755	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,737	1,250	45.7
Economically disadvantaged students	26,544	15,416	58.1
Migratory students	37	17	46.0
Male	24,235	16,247	67.0
Female	22,960	14,710	64.1
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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	47,124	29,331	62.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,836	5,151	58.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	867	603	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,127	2,405	46.9
Hispanic	5,175	2,468	47.7
White, non-Hispanic	27,119	18,704	69.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,829	3,689	47.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,612	841	32.2
Economically disadvantaged students	26,282	14,027	53.4
Migratory students	37	13	35.1
Male	24,169	14,398	59.6
Female	22,919	14,917	65.1
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Oklahoma does not administer a science assessment at Grade 4.			

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

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	47,011	29,671	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,814	5,172	58.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	923	705	76.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,285	2,629	49.7
Hispanic	5,042	2,740	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	26,947	18,425	68.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,881	3,441	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,180	896	41.1
Economically disadvantaged students	26,018	14,448	55.5
Migratory students	45	17	37.8
Male	24,134	15,468	64.1
Female	22,821	14,169	62.1
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who 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	46,965	29,662	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,809	5,153	58.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	901	645	71.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,282	2,638	49.9
Hispanic	4,987	2,562	51.4
White, non-Hispanic	26,986	18,664	69.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,905	3,156	39.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,077	691	33.3
Economically disadvantaged students	25,942	14,333	55.2
Migratory students	42	14	33.3
Male	24,103	14,434	59.9
Female	22,814	15,203	66.6
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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	46,337	38,661	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,726	7,183	82.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	910	794	87.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,170	3,572	69.1
Hispanic	4,989	3,685	73.9
White, non-Hispanic	26,542	23,427	88.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,241	5,160	71.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,171	1,286	59.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,787	20,044	77.7
Migratory students	44	23	52.3
Male	23,699	19,790	83.5
Female	22,591	18,830	83.4
Comments:			

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

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	45,386	28,486	62.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,458	4,906	58.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	921	726	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,804	2,198	45.8
Hispanic	4,633	2,439	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	26,570	18,217	68.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,170	3,206	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,010	754	37.5
Economically disadvantaged students	23,875	12,814	53.7
Migratory students	54	29	53.7
Male	23,073	14,536	63.0
Female	22,258	13,924	62.6
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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	45,342	28,252	62.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,464	4,853	57.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	894	652	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,809	2,241	46.6
Hispanic	4,591	2,260	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	26,584	18,246	68.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,191	2,688	37.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,912	552	28.9
Economically disadvantaged students	23,755	12,596	53.0
Migratory students	52	22	42.3
Male	23,044	13,446	58.4
Female	22,245	14,788	66.5
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

Source – Initially populated from EDData. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDData 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: Oklahoma does not administer a science assessment at Grade 6.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPA 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	44,526	27,287	61.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,211	4,616	56.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	894	725	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,707	2,066	43.9
Hispanic	4,495	2,205	49.0
White, non-Hispanic	26,219	17,675	67.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,042	2,888	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,727	560	32.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22,470	11,524	51.3
Migratory students	34	11	32.4
Male	22,987	14,213	61.8
Female	21,474	13,049	60.8
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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.

1.3.2.5 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	44,426	29,941	67.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,212	5,175	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	868	693	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,701	2,336	49.7
Hispanic	4,451	2,404	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	26,194	19,333	73.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,024	2,925	41.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,663	524	31.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,398	13,056	58.3
Migratory students	34	18	52.9
Male	22,934	14,648	63.9
Female	21,431	15,264	71.2
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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.

1.3.3.5 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			
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: Oklahoma does not administer a science assessment at Grade 7.			

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

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	44,422	26,378	59.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,264	4,470	54.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	871	667	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,741	2,132	45.0
Hispanic	4,332	2,071	47.8
White, non-Hispanic	26,214	17,038	65.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,958	2,516	36.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,741	540	31.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,539	10,723	49.8
Migratory students	40	14	35.0
Male	22,673	13,272	58.5
Female	21,697	13,092	60.3
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who 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	44,449	29,267	65.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,302	5,248	63.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	855	618	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,746	2,336	49.2
Hispanic	4,301	2,031	47.2
White, non-Hispanic	26,245	19,034	72.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,995	3,141	44.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,665	343	20.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,597	11,975	55.4
Migratory students	39	18	46.2
Male	22,678	14,440	63.7
Female	21,715	14,795	68.1
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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	43,900	37,950	86.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,197	7,010	85.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	861	753	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,661	3,418	73.3
Hispanic	4,285	3,271	76.3
White, non-Hispanic	25,896	23,498	90.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,461	4,714	73.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,748	995	56.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,546	17,324	80.4
Migratory students	40	28	70.0
Male	22,352	19,223	86.0
Female	21,502	18,687	86.9
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online C SPR 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	47,043	36,235	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,881	6,532	73.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	991	893	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,248	3,198	60.9
Hispanic	4,130	2,848	69.0
White, non-Hispanic	27,793	22,764	81.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,275	3,764	51.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,383	775	56.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19,667	13,914	70.8
Migratory students	40	24	60.0
Male	24,000	18,254	76.1
Female	22,957	17,942	78.2
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.

1.3.2.7 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	42,697	31,940	74.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,926	5,703	72.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	903	720	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,446	2,495	56.1
Hispanic	3,595	2,230	62.0
White, non-Hispanic	25,827	20,792	80.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,389	2,985	46.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,301	488	37.5
Economically disadvantaged students	16,708	10,972	65.7
Migratory students	19	7	36.8
Male	21,549	15,353	71.2
Female	21,019	16,523	78.6
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	40,616	28,769	70.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,572	5,077	67.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	945	746	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,065	1,980	48.7
Hispanic	3,542	1,915	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	24,492	19,051	77.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,826	3,166	54.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,162	389	33.5
Economically disadvantaged students	16,359	9,884	60.4
Migratory students	23	7	30.4
Male	20,651	14,800	71.7
Female	19,868	13,918	70.0
Comments: Oklahoma established new achievement standards for Biology I in 2008-2009, which increased the number of students attaining proficiency.			

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	1,790	1,600	89.4
Districts	534	472	88.4
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 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	1,122	972	86.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	925	791	85.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	197	181	91.9
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
530	465	87.7
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 ¹ Year 1, School Improvement ¹ 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	8
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	4
Comments:	

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.

Hamilton Middle School/Tulsa Public Schools:
 Created key positions-math interventionists
 Provided strategic technology programs for students
 Provided additional time for teachers to work with parents
 Provided ongoing coaching and professional development, which consisted of data driven instruction and classroom management
 Utilized What Works in Schools strategies
 • Utilized support from the School Support Teams
 Madison Middle School/Tulsa Public Schools:
 Provided strategic, ongoing professional development, which included differentiated instruction, classroom management and data driven instruction
 Provided extended learning opportunities, such as Saturday school
 • Utilized outside consultants to work with teachers
 Will Rogers High School/Tulsa Public Schools
 Provided professional development to improve school culture.
 Utilized professional development to support differentiated instruction and data driven instruction
 Utilized the What Works in Schools strategies

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.

During the 2008-2009 year there were 2 districts in improvement in Oklahoma: Cave Springs Public Schools and Idabel Public Schools.

Districts were notified of the District Improvement Toolkit on the OSDE Website and completed District Improvement plans which were reviewed and approved by the OSDE staff. To provide further technical assistance, a point to point videoconference was held with Idabel and a conference call was held with Cave Springs. Both districts made AYP this year and exited District Improvement in 2009. Our annual professional development with Dr. Robert Marzano was available for fall and winter leadership seminars.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: There were no districts in corrective action.	

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	1	1
Schools	43	1
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	09/11/09
---	----------

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	10,068	9,168
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	4,383	5,392
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	43.5	58.8
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	9,761	9,003
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	4,216	5,318
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	43.2	59.1
Comments: Oklahoma raised the achievement standards for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 in 2008-2009, which decreased the number of students attaining proficiency.		

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	23
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	15
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	14

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	Extended learning time, tutoring, technology integration, special education inclusion, frequent monitoring of student achievement, curriculum mapping, interventionists in math and reading, varied instructional practice training, looping teachers, usage of OSDE website tools.	19	8	11	C	
6 = Combo 1	1, 2, and 3	40	12	16	C	

Comments: Strategy 4 was used extensively at the SEA level to provide professional development to School Support Team leaders and members to assist schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. School Support Team leaders and members are not employed in schools receiving 1003a and 1003g funds; therefore, Strategy 4 cannot be attributed to individual school sites.

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The School Improvement Overview meeting begins the process of providing technical assistance and ongoing support to the schools in improvement. Effective strategies were shared with our schools by School Support Team members collaborating with Oklahoma's School Improvement sites. Oklahoma's School Support Teams are highly skilled, experienced, and successful educators and consist of a School Support Team leader who is a retired educator; a currently practicing educator; and a representative of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Additional members are added to differentiate support for schools needing additional assistance in math, reading, high school, ELL, or special education. Current members include assistant superintendents and other top-level administrators; directors of curriculum, Title I, federal programs, special education, elementary, middle and high school principals including two at National Title I Distinguished Schools, executive directors, and professors in higher education. All School Improvement sites have attended the What Works in Schools professional development with Dr. Robert Marzano and Debra Pickering presenting successful proven scientifically based research activities, including Building Academic Vocabulary, including small group face-to-face discussions with Dr. Marzano, Debra Pickering and Vera Blake. All School Improvement sites have also shared effective strategies with one another through presentations, visiting other school sites and participating in listserves. The Data Retreat®, Adolescent Literacy focusing on Dr. Mark Forget's Max Teaching with Reading and Writing, and regional curriculum conferences were attended by School Improvement teams as well. The School Support Teams used Oklahoma's Nine Essential Elements comprehensive system framework as "look fors" (performance indicators) when visiting and observing sites and classrooms. Three formal visits are made throughout the year to examine the areas of focus: Academic Learning, Learning Environment, and Efficiency. Specific, differentiated recommendations are made for each school based on the review of Oklahoma's Nine Essential Elements Performance Indicators. Those schools that are in planning for restructuring or restructuring are provided an Educational Leadership Coach (ELC). The ELCs work directly with the principal to provide support and guidance with the ultimate goal of improved teaching and learning.

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.

All schools identified for improvement must submit a comprehensive School Improvement plan which is reviewed by members of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Those schools that are targeted for School Support Teams (SST) also have their School Improvement plan reviewed by the School Support Team leaders. School Support Team members have 3 scheduled visits per year and members observe implementation of the plan. SST reports are written and feedback and suggestions are given to each school. Other technical assistance includes the What Works in Schools 2 day conferences twice a year. Dr. Marzano and other presenters (Debra Pickering, Vera Blake) provide small group sessions to principals and receive feedback on appropriate interventions. Principals are able to ask questions on specific school improvement initiatives. Building Academic Vocabulary assistance is also a focus for our School Improvement sites. Schools receive training by Debra Pickering. The Adolescent Literacy conference was also available to all School Improvement sites. The Data Retreat® conference was also attended by all School Improvement teams. This 3 day conference focused on using data to identify those students needing the most assistance and then providing targeted, timely interventions to each student.

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.

Activities in the state that were supported with funds other than 1003a and 1003g are listed as follows:

Non Title I schools in improvement were supported by School Support Teams through the Curriculum Department.

Title I and Non Title I schools in improvement were supported through the regional curriculum conferences.

Pocket PASS printed for the state standards: Priority Academic Student Skills

Parent's Guide to PASS

Special Education training on co-teaching and other special education initiatives.

Building Academic Vocabulary training

Master Teacher's Project

State Superintendent's Math Academies

State Superintendent's Science Inquiry Institute

Mathematics and Science Partnerships (Title IIB)

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	12,922
Applied to transfer	213
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	202

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	\$ 833,176

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	11

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	10,097
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,020
Received supplemental educational services	2,251
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 2,382,046
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	148,087	146,602	99.0	1,485	1.0
All elementary classes	60,570	59,950	99.0	620	1.0
All secondary classes	87,517	86,652	99.0	865	1.0

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.

Self-contained classes are counted as one class

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
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	67.9
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	32.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.3

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The total percent is over 100 because our data is broken down at the student level. If a class has both regular and special education students then it is possible to be counted in both percentages.

	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)	84.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	17.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	101.9

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The total percent is over 100 because our data is broken down at the student level. If a class has both regular and special education students then it is possible to be counted in both percentages.

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	16,190	16,019	98.9
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	15,304	15,107	98.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	11,718	11,566	98.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	37,782	37,429	99.1

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	79.9	49.6
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program	
Secondary schools	74.0	44.6
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Cherokee, 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 types of programs being provided to LEP students in Oklahoma include the following: content area tutoring, inclusionary support, pull-out for individuals, and newcomer centers.

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	35,555
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.	32,588
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	29,081
Cherokee	1,240
Vietnamese	931
Hmong	587
Chinese	327

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	35,261
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	326
Total	35,587
Comments: The total number tested is larger than the total number of LEP students because the LEP student count is based on October 1, 2008 enrollment, and the total number tested is based on the number of students tested in spring 2009. Many Oklahoma districts experience a population surge during the spring semester. This surge would equate to a surge in the number tested.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	6,784
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	19.1
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	31,491
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	280
Total	31,771
Comments:	
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.	6,465

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	15,913	56.9	16,211	75.00
ELP attainment	6,344	22.7	5,983	19.00

Comments: Per ED and PSC, Oklahoma needs to explain how the Results Percentages should have been calculated. "Making Progress" should be calculated as "making progress"/("making progress" + "not making progress") = 15,913/21,615 = 73.6% "ELP Attainment" should be calculated as "ELP attainment"/"total Title III LEP students tested" = 6,344/31,491 = 20.1%

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:

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:

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:

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
6,366	4,778	11,144
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
6,306	4,392	69.6	1,914
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
6,201	4,121	66.5	2,080
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
2,132	1,760	82.6	372
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	57
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	20
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	23
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	36
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	38
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	30
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	30
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	1
Comments: Consortia members are counted as one in the total number of subgrantees for the purposes of calculating Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives. However, consortia members are documented individually in the area of Title III improvement plan implementation since school improvement is district and site specific.	

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	No
Comments: Oklahoma missed the "Making Progress" target of 75% by 298 students (73.6%).	

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
4,515	616	7

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.	787
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	411

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	66	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	58	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	45	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	54	
Other (Explain in comment box)	16	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	74	16,771
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	51	2,450
PD provided to principals	67	1,337
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	67	639
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	54	1,876
PD provided to community based organization personnel	15	313
Total	95	23,386

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Subgrantees offered the following professional development training to their staff: Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), literacy strategies, Schools Attuned, Ruby Payne, effective instructional strategies for diverse learners, English language development parent outreach, Great Expectations, and Spanish for educators and school personnel.

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
07/10/08	09/01/08	53
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 Bilingual Education/Title III Office sends a preliminary estimate of funds to all districts in Oklahoma before the Federal Grant Application process begins. School districts start applying for their federal grants through the consolidated application process before the school year ends in May. Applications are then due at the end of June. In order to comply with this deadline, districts may complete a budget and justification with an estimate of funds. Because a final notice of funds is not received until July 1 or after, the state does not know what the per student allocation will be but may estimate based on the district's previous year's allocation. There is never a true delay in funding to the districts. Funding is available to the districts as soon as it is made available to the state.

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: Oklahoma has no schools that meet the definition of persistently dangerous schools.	

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	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	75.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	66.5
Hispanic	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	78.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	81.7
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	77.4
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Oklahoma does not collect graduation rate data by LEP, migrant, male, or female.	

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	3.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.5
Hispanic	5.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.5
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	3.8
Migratory students	
Male	3.8
Female	3.3
Comments: Oklahoma does not collect dropout data on LEP and Migrant students.	

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	514	514
LEAs with subgrants	18	18
Total	532	532
Comments:		

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)	235	437
K	442	780
1	434	725
2	431	652
3	359	590
4	338	594
5	324	556
6	267	523
7	307	456
8	328	490
9	307	525
10	312	397
11	233	325
12	328	343
Ungraded	6	95
Total	4,651	7,488
Comments:		

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	809	1,512
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,042	5,399
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	650	436
Hotels/Motels	150	141
Total	4,651	7,488
Comments:		

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)	437
K	780
1	725
2	652
3	590
4	594
5	556
6	523
7	456
8	490
9	525
10	397
11	325
12	343
Ungraded	95
Total	7,488
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	532
Migratory children/youth	N<5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	707
Limited English proficient students	687
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	12
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	10
Transportation	10
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	11
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	11
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	9
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	13
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	9
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	8
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other 1: Expenses related to school events such as graduation/prom/etc. Other 2: Bus passes Other 3: Post graduate assistance

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	3
School Selection	1
Transportation	2
School records	4
Immunizations	4
Other medical records	3
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other 1: Food stamps, Sooner care Other 2: Completion of post high school applications

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	176	88
4	228	114
5	252	126
6	196	98
7	236	118
8	188	94
High School	76	38
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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		
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)	71
K	55
1	53
2	57
3	73
4	63
5	54
6	55
7	46
8	46
9	46
10	42
11	31
12	33
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	48
Total	773
Comments: Oklahoma does not have any Ungraded students eligible.	

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 migrant population in Oklahoma continues to decline as families do not move after expiration of their term of eligibility. Though it is difficult to pinpoint any one cause of this reduction in eligibility, the overall national economy is considered to be a contributing factor as wage-earners have become less likely to leave current employment when future job prospects are questionable. These reported numbers are accurate for the requested period.

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)	0
K	N<5
1	N<5
2	N<5
3	N<5
4	6
5	N<5
6	N<5
7	5
8	N<5
9	N<5
10	N<5
11	N<5
12	N<5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	35
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Coinciding with the statewide reduction in migrant numbers, schools are less likely to hold Summer sessions funded fully or in part with migrant funds. As schools need only report numbers as they pertain to migrant-only sessions, the reported numbers are accurate for this category.

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.

Oklahoma used the MIS2000 system to compile and generate Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. The same system was used for the last 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.

Student information (name, birth date, gender, race, place of birth, parents' or guardians' names, migrant student ID number) eligibility information (QAD residency date, termination date, withdrawal date, qualifying activity) and school information enrollment date, withdrawal date, enrollment type (school year/summer) attendance.

MEP/LEA staff (recruiters, teachers, aides and record clerks) recruit migrant children through interviews with parents or legal guardian either face-to-face or home visits or phone interviews. MEP/LEA staff update existing COEs through a verification process such as one-on-one interviews and home visits. Results of interviews are recorded on COEs.

COEs are completed upon identification of migrant families or children. Summer school project enrollment information is collected at the end of each project and during student record update procedures.

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.

Oklahoma has a state maintained database system through MIS2000. All migrant sites submit hard copies of COEs and COE update forms via United States Postal Service to the Oklahoma State Department of Education where data is verified to be accurate. Based on conversations held during home visits, the COEs are updated with the information and eligibility information. All changes and updates are sent to the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

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.

Not applicable.

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.

The MIS2000 system can generate a query that filters out any child who did not meet the following criteria during the child count period; between the ages of 3-21 and has not graduated from high school, was within 36 months of Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and has had a 3rd birthday before the end date.

A report is generated that gives a 12-month unduplicated count or list of students between the ages of 3-21, who are within 3 years of the QAD and who had a Residency QAD, Withdrawal Date, Enroll Date or Term Date during the date range of 9-1-08 to 8-31-09.

The same procedure is used as in the first paragraph of 1.10.3.3 with the exception of the School History, Type-Summer School is identified by Enrollment Type.

In an attempt to avoid duplication of student records, a search of the local database is performed for each student identified. A search is performed by the last name spelling as reported and if no match is found, then any other possible last name spelling are used such as Rodriguez might be Redriguez or Rodriques etc. A search is also conducted with birthdate, legal father and/or legal mother. If no match is made then a search is made by birth date and/or first name. If no matches are found a new student ID number is created for the child. A query of the database is performed to identify any possibilities of duplicated numbers. The query pulls out students with similar names and birth dates to check possible duplication. If there are duplications, they are corrected by merging the data into one student record. Another query is run to identify and verify that any children identified as having residency before the funding begin date are still in the state after the begin date. Any child who was not in residency is eliminated from the Category 1 child count.

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 MIS2000 database is used to collect and maintain both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

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.

All COEs and COE updates submitted to the Oklahoma State Department of Education are reviewed for accuracy and eligibility by the state coordinator before the data is entered onto the data base. The forms are reviewed and signed by the migrant coordinator, migrant specialist and the migrant director before data entry. Random checks of COEs are done by re-interviewing a random sample of migrant parents. During school monitoring a list of migrant students is reviewed for attendance data. Procedures are provided to summer session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data. In an attempt to avoid duplication of student records, a search of the local database is performed for each student identified. A search is performed by the last name spelling as reported and if no match is found, then any other possible last name spelling are used such as Rodriquez might be Rodriguez or Rodriques etc. If no match is made then a search is made by birth date and/or first name. If no matches are found a new student ID number is created for the child.

A query of the database is performed to identify any possibilities of duplicated numbers. The query pulls out students with similar names and birth dates to check possible duplication. If there are duplications, they are corrected by merging the data into one student record.

Another query is run to identify and verify that any children identified as having residency before the funding begin date are still in the state after the begin date. Any child who was not in residency is eliminated from the Category 1 child count.

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.

Oklahoma contracted with Educational Research & Training Corporation (ERTC) to complete a statewide re-interview process. In order to obtain a valid sample, ERTC re-interviewed 267 migrant students. The sample size of 267 was calculated based on the total number of eligible students in 2007-2008 as reported to the United States Office of Migrant Education (OME) (Total N = 870 students). The sample size represents the number required to estimate the proportion of defects in migrant child eligibility determinations statewide at a 95 percent confidence interval with an error rate of no more than plus/minus five percent. The re-interviewing process for Oklahoma was completed by ERTC between December of 2008 and February of 2009. The families of the 267 migrant children were re-interviewed within twenty school districts throughout the state of Oklahoma. Of the 267 interviewed, 238 were found to be eligible which resulted in a 10.86% defect rate. The results of this re-interview initiative were forwarded to and accepted by OME.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year the following steps are taken by staff to check child count data: all COEs are reviewed by staff for accuracy and eligibility determination. This consists of checking QAD date, residency date, moved from, moved to, children moved with Qualifying Activity Code and comments. Any questionable data is reviewed and a call is placed to the school district for clarification. Districts are required to conduct their own re-interviews of currently enrolled families.

Eligible households are re-interviewed on a yearly basis to determine ongoing eligibility. LEA recruiters and staff meet with families prior to school enrollment and discuss ongoing eligibility, a second or third year evaluation COE is completed and it is noted on the form whether or not the household retains eligibility. Upon receipt of the COE, the SEA reviews the document and takes appropriate action, either removing the student from the program or continuing service.

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.

Prior to submission of the Category 1 and Category 2 counts to the USDE, a preliminary report is run after all COEs have been submitted by the districts. This report is then compared to numbers submitted by each district and checked for duplication of numbers by last name, birth date and ID#.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Overall, Oklahoma has seen an increase in accuracy; however, further training of district personnel has been pursued via videoconferences and a statewide conference held in October. Prospective re-interviewing is completed during monitoring visits. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oklahoma MEP has confidence in the accuracy of the reported child counts and eligibility based on the MIS2000 system, training of recruiters in identification and recruiting procedures, and the re-interview process. All migrant recruiters in Oklahoma are provided with a state Identification and Recruitment Guidebook. The most recent version is dated September 2009.