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

PENNSYLVANIA

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:

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

   X Part I, 2008-09   ___Part II, 2008-09

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

Address:
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Erin Oberdorf

Telephone: 717-783-9161

Fax: 717-787-8634

e-mail: eoberdorf@state.pa.us

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

_____   _Friday, March 12, 2010, 11:42:33 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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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.

Pennsylvania will have an operational alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in mathematics in 2009-2010. An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in reading will be operational in 2010-2011.

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 <u>not</u> 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 assessment and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance withESEA. 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 Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	944,828		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,453		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,313		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	144,244		>97%
Hispanic	68,966		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	693,042		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	159,294		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,915		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	351,848		>97%
Migratory students	969		>97%
Male	485,117		>97%
Female	458,286		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA). Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> 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	58,149	37.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	85,808	54.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,407	8.5
Total	157,364	
Comments: PDE will look into the discrepancy between the two total numbers of children with disabilities participating.		

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	943,538		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,452		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	26,925		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	144,127		>97%
Hispanic	68,414		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	692,835		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	159,238		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,658		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	350,983		>97%
Migratory students	954		>97%
Male	484,444		>97%
Female	457,672		>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 <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> 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	59,136	37.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	84,447	53.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,408	8.5
Total	156,991	
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	409,722		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	671		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,303		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	60,579		>97%
Hispanic	27,892		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	305,064		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	67,413		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,763		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	142,208		>97%
Migratory students	340		>97%
Male	209,551		>97%
Female	199,139		>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 <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> 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		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total		
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	131,224	105,773	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	165	75.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,231	3,821	90.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,469	12,386	60.5
Hispanic	10,405	6,623	63.6
White, non-Hispanic	94,292	81,567	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,712	11,803	54.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,957	2,657	53.6
Economically disadvantaged students	53,537	36,691	68.5
Migratory students	193	118	61.1
Male	67,388	54,336	80.6
Female	63,743	51,373	80.6
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.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	130,852	99,523	76.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	154	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,154	3,511	84.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,422	11,300	55.3
Hispanic	10,274	5,757	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	94,184	77,678	82.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,674	9,601	44.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,689	1,943	41.4
Economically disadvantaged students	53,313	33,137	62.2
Migratory students	188	90	47.9
Male	67,186	49,009	73.0
Female	63,576	50,456	79.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	131,337	106,439	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	220	161	73.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,916	3,582	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,655	12,754	61.8
Hispanic	10,399	6,867	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	94,599	81,929	86.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,934	12,673	55.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,950	2,038	51.6
Economically disadvantaged students	53,044	36,613	69.0
Migratory students	191	123	64.4
Male	67,578	54,873	81.2
Female	63,668	51,506	80.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.2 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	131,036	94,196	71.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	220	140	63.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,848	3,183	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,608	10,217	49.6
Hispanic	10,291	5,345	51.9
White, non-Hispanic	94,525	74,321	78.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,903	8,965	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,724	1,103	29.6
Economically disadvantaged students	52,854	29,537	55.9
Migratory students	187	85	45.4
Male	67,420	45,933	68.1
Female	63,525	48,209	75.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 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	130,793	108,470	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	176	80.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,907	3,415	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20,396	11,878	58.2
Hispanic	10,281	6,431	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	94,413	85,366	90.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,693	14,625	64.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,911	1,733	44.3
Economically disadvantaged students	52,539	36,579	69.6
Migratory students	189	107	56.6
Male	67,196	55,394	82.4
Female	63,469	52,986	83.5
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.

1.3.1.3 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	131,175	95,383	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	130	71.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,963	3,438	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,487	10,305	50.3
Hispanic	10,271	5,644	55.0
White, non-Hispanic	94,862	74,952	79.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,994	9,375	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,624	1,302	35.9
Economically disadvantaged students	52,035	30,234	58.1
Migratory students	214	105	49.1
Male	67,612	48,935	72.4
Female	63,467	46,392	73.1
Comments:			

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

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

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	130,831	83,491	63.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	107	59.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,882	2,950	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,442	8,221	40.2
Hispanic	10,168	4,178	41.1
White, non-Hispanic	94,753	67,251	71.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,937	6,368	27.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,395	532	15.7
Economically disadvantaged students	51,827	24,109	46.5
Migratory students	211	70	33.2
Male	67,431	40,817	60.5
Female	63,305	42,622	67.3
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	132,066	98,997	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	124	72.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,886	3,446	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,514	10,932	53.3
Hispanic	10,010	5,482	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	96,177	78,153	81.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,581	8,756	38.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,312	1,189	35.9
Economically disadvantaged students	50,804	30,701	60.4
Migratory students	96	41	42.7
Male	67,474	49,930	74.0
Female	64,484	49,019	76.0
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.4 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	131,753	88,117	66.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	119	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,820	3,026	79.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,470	8,755	42.8
Hispanic	9,920	4,152	41.8
White, non-Hispanic	96,075	71,297	74.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,543	6,251	27.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,113	459	14.7
Economically disadvantaged students	50,620	24,728	48.8
Migratory students	93	22	23.7
Male	67,313	42,326	62.9
Female	64,334	45,743	71.1
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

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:			

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	136,586	101,541	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	126	62.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,873	3,445	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,798	10,972	52.8
Hispanic	9,906	5,389	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	100,531	80,850	80.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,137	8,349	36.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,135	1,110	35.4
Economically disadvantaged students	50,848	29,974	59.0
Migratory students	122	56	45.9
Male	70,559	51,589	73.1
Female	65,856	49,884	75.8
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.5 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	136,200	96,155	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	134	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,806	3,121	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,721	10,244	49.4
Hispanic	9,761	4,741	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	100,442	77,183	76.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,057	6,818	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,896	556	19.2
Economically disadvantaged students	50,573	26,980	53.4
Migratory students	120	34	28.3
Male	70,338	46,218	65.7
Female	65,694	49,885	75.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who 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:			

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	139,737	98,369	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	130	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,822	3,343	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21,166	10,264	48.5
Hispanic	9,958	5,034	50.6
White, non-Hispanic	103,353	78,993	76.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,585	7,196	30.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,785	915	32.8
Economically disadvantaged students	50,633	27,426	54.2
Migratory students	100	48	48.0
Male	71,828	49,755	69.3
Female	67,671	48,539	71.7
Comments:			

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

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

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	139,378	111,050	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	227	158	69.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,769	3,325	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	21,096	13,244	62.8
Hispanic	9,844	5,940	60.3
White, non-Hispanic	103,247	87,631	84.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,530	9,351	39.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,590	764	29.5
Economically disadvantaged students	50,396	33,050	65.6
Migratory students	98	40	40.8
Male	71,635	53,952	75.3
Female	67,514	56,991	84.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.6 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	138,403	75,493	54.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	225	95	42.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,782	2,644	69.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,756	4,820	23.2
Hispanic	9,820	2,407	24.5
White, non-Hispanic	102,671	65,130	63.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,204	4,980	21.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,734	256	9.4
Economically disadvantaged students	49,913	16,137	32.3
Migratory students	98	14	14.3
Male	71,102	39,746	55.9
Female	67,118	35,703	53.2
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.

1.3.1.7 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	137,698	75,756	55.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	99	43.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,546	2,780	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,812	5,318	28.3
Hispanic	7,519	2,259	30.0
White, non-Hispanic	106,379	64,923	61.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,421	3,430	16.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,028	488	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	38,559	13,569	35.2
Migratory students	47	13	27.7
Male	69,873	38,831	55.6
Female	67,336	36,818	54.7
Comments:			

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

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

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	137,410	88,622	64.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	124	54.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,511	2,569	73.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18,768	7,164	38.2
Hispanic	7,447	2,881	38.7
White, non-Hispanic	106,258	75,384	70.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,347	4,449	21.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,937	281	14.5
Economically disadvantaged students	38,411	16,857	43.9
Migratory students	47	9	19.2
Male	69,722	42,286	60.6
Female	67,212	46,187	68.7
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.7 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	133,507	52,585	39.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	70	32.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,453	1,743	50.5
Black, non-Hispanic	16,843	1,890	11.2
Hispanic	6,989	1,030	14.7
White, non-Hispanic	104,747	47,629	45.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,479	2,273	11.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,899	82	4.3
Economically disadvantaged students	35,897	7,058	19.7
Migratory students	47	N<10	
Male	67,605	28,074	41.5
Female	65,317	24,449	37.4
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.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	3,109	2,439	78.4
Districts	527	489	92.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	1,821	1,441	79.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	681	381	56.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,140	1,060	93.0
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
500	474	94.8
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

---

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under 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	112
Extension of the school year or school day	5
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	10
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	13
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	112
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)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	1
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	11
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.

For Pennsylvania, there were 11 schools that chose "other major restructuring of the school governance" action. Of those, two schools closed. Three of the schools reconstituted and changed grade configuration and organizational structure.
The six remaining schools restructured in combination with other corrective actions.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State'ts 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 [2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) believes in "Every child by name reaching core academic proficiency in core academic disciplines regardless of zip code, economic status, race, ethnicity or disability. PDE has implemented many programs and strategies for districts identified for improvement or corrective action.

I. The Pennsylvania Standards Aligned System (SAS) is a collaborative product of research and good practice that identifies six distinct elements which, if utilized together, will provide schools and districts a common framework for continuous school and district enhancement and improvement. Research supports the notion that great schools and school systems tend to have six common elements that ensure Student Achievement: Clear Standards, Fair Assessments, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, and Interventions.

Pennsylvania Standards describe what students should know and be able to do; they increase in complexity and sophistication as students progress through school. The Assessment Anchors clarify the Standards assessed on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) and can be used by educators to help prepare students for the PSSA. The Assessment Anchors clarify the relationship between state Standards and our assessment system. Assessment Anchors are further elaborated with Eligible Content. Eligible Content identifies how deeply an Anchor should be covered and specifies the range of the content to best prepare students for the PSSA. Not all of the Eligible Content is assessed on the PSSA, but it shows the range of knowledge from which we design the test.

Fair Assessment is a process used by teachers and students before, during, and after instruction to provide feedback and adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve student achievement. In Pennsylvania the four types of assessment are summative, formative, benchmark, and diagnostic.

The Curriculum Framework specifies what is to be taught for each subject in the curriculum. Curriculum Frameworks include Big Ideas, Concepts, Competencies, Essential Questions, Vocabulary, and Exemplars aligned to Standards and Assessment Anchors and, where appropriate, Eligible Content.

Aligned Instruction comprises the following activities: Teaching topics aligned with the Standards, Ensuring the right level of challenge, Focusing teaching based on the learning needs of each student, Implementing instructional strategies to increase student achievement.

Materials and Resources includes Voluntary Model Curriculum incorporating learning progressions, units, lesson plans, and content resources aligned to the Pennsylvania Standards in curriculum frameworks for the four major content areas (mathematics, science, social studies, reading-writing-speaking-listening). Learning progressions span grades K-12 and include what all students should know and be able to do as a result of successfully moving through grades K-8 and by taking specific courses in grades 9-12.

Interventions ensure students are provided with supports they need to meet/exceed grade level Standards. A comprehensive system of Interventions involves a graduated set of safety nets aligned to specific student needs and Standards.

II. PDE established GETTING RESULTS, the continuous school improvement planning framework uniquely customized for Pennsylvania. GETTING RESULTS builds on the experiences and recommendations of Pennsylvania schools, districts, and Intermediate Units. It incorporates current thinking and priorities of PDE regarding continuous school improvement and outlines the phases vital to developing a results-focused continuous school improvement plan. There are seven phases to GETTING RESULTS:

Organize and review data. Emphasizes the need for multiple data sources, including summative, formative, and perceptual.
Analyze data and discover root cause. Offers worksheets for analyzing data from multiple data sources and finding the underlying causes of the state of student achievement based on the six components of SAS.
Plan solution. Aligns analysis of data and root cause with strategic action planning,
Implement the plan. The school improvement plan must be a living document that is routinely revisited and monitored by the administration
and leadership team of the school.
Analyze evidence of effectiveness. Guides reflection of plan implementation and effectiveness.
Revise the plan. Makes refinements and revisions after a status review of the two year plan.

Implement the revision. An addendum to the two year plan that refines and focuses on school improvement efforts.

III. From 2000 to the present, PDE has provided funds to 12 of the most struggling districts that are in need of school improvement funding and financial support. These districts are called Empowerment Districts. Six of these districts have improved to the extent that they have

IV. PDE established the Distinguished Educator (DEs) Initiative to provide support and targeted assistance to struggling districts. PDE selected a cadre of experts, who will be hired and managed by an IU, and assigned them as part of a team to support districts who demonstrate readiness to receive technical assistance. DEs work as part of a team, providing their expertise to assist struggling districts in identifying instructional or systemic barriers and critical gaps to improving student achievement and then work alongside that district's staff to overcome those barriers and fill those gaps. The DE role is flexible in order to meet the unique needs of different districts, schools and students. While in one school system, the DE may serve as a coach/mentor, in another district, the DE may drive more prescriptive solutions, if that school or district is not showing adequate improvement in student achievement after a given amount of time. Additionally, the DEs have a feedback function by providing PDE with input in establishing policies that drive student achievement.

V. PDE established an on-going technical assistance network in coordination with the 29 IUs and the DEs for planning sessions with IU personnel, the DE, and school personnel to identify district needs, coordinate service delivery, etc. Professional Development for school district staff from buildings is provided by IU staff and DEs. The IU will provide the historical background of the district and school and inform the DE of the specific needs from the plans of each school in School Improvement or Corrective Action. Facilitation in areas such as data analysis/retreats, root cause analysis, customized data packet development, curriculum audits, on-going monitoring of plan implementation is provided.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	16
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	3
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	15
Restructured the district	9
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	12	4
Schools	115	30
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	08/19/09

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	126,701	155,071
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	65,542	104,135
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	51.7	67.2
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	126,003	103,523
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	61,667	296
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	48.9	0.3
Comments:		

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	120
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	195
Comments:	

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.**
Comments: Pennsylvania does not collect this data.						

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.

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Pennsylvania established a statewide infrastructure for school improvement to provide a state-supported framework through the Statewide System of Support (SSOS). The SSOS is supported by the PA Department of Education (PDE) which provides funding and assistance to the state's 29 IUs and school districts. The program goals are: 1) to ensure that schools and districts have access to high-quality school improvement and professional development services targeted to their unique needs; 2) to help build the capacity of all Intermediate Units (IUs) to provide these services and; 3) to leverage funds to include external partners, such as higher education institutions to further build long-term school improvement capacity throughout the state. PDE provided three levels of funding to improve the coordination between the SEA, the IUs and the LEAs.

The SSOS provides a network that ensures that all public schools and districts in the Commonwealth are aware of and can use the PDE school improvement tools, programs, and frameworks designed to improve student achievement.

In addition, PDE provided the Governor's Institute on Data Driven Instruction which was a 5 day professional development conference for districts. The purpose of this conference was to provide training on the different types of assessment. This conference featured international experts in the field and workshops for the districts.

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) <u>evaluation</u> and <u>technical assistance</u> activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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	220,612
Applied to transfer	226
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	271

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	$ 739,208

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	

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	27,142
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,628
Received supplemental educational services	1,092
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	$ 739,208
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	368,602	353,603	95.9	14,999	4.1
All elementary classes	101,180	98,042	96.9	3,138	3.1
All secondary classes	267,422	255,561	95.6	11,861	4.4
PA schools were classified as elementary or secondary using a new procedure for 2008-2009 that results in more schools being classified and included as elementary and secondary schools. With the new procedure, no schools are excluded because they do not have an "elementary" or "secondary" grade level configuration designation included in the PA Department of Education's "Education Names and Addresses Application" file. Secondary schools include any high school with grade 10 &/or grade 11 &/or grade 12 and any middle school with grade 7 &/or grade 8 &/or grade 9 but no grade 10 &/or grade 11 &/or grade 12; and an elementary school is a school that is neither middle nor high school (any combination of grades PreK-6). Further refinements to PA's data collection and classification of data, resulted in an increase in the number of core academic classes at both elementary and secondary class levels.					

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.

Currently PA counts full-day self-contained elementary classes as one class. PA uses unique departmentalized course codes for each core academic subject at the sixth grade level. Consequently departmentalized sixth grade courses are counted multiple times.

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	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	19.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	22.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	58.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Beginning in 2007-2008, LEAs submitted HQT data elements into PA's new data management system. As a result of converting to a new data system, the PA Department of Education is able to report HQT/NHQT percentages at the classroom level. Prior to the submission of the 2007-2008 HQT data elements, PA's data system was limited to calculating HQT/NHQT percentages based on the top three teaching assignments submitted by each LEA. However, the data reported at this time represent preliminary data that will be corrected during the correction period in 2010.

The percentage of elementary school classes in the "other" category above represent educators who are teaching outside of their certificate (out-of-field).

	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)	50.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	23.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	26.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Beginning in 2007-2008, LEAs submitted HQT data elements into PA's new data management system. As a result of converting to a new data system, the PA Department of Education is now able to report HQT/NHQT percentages at the classroom level. Prior to the submission of the 2007-2008 HQT data elements, PA's data system was limited to calculating HQT/NHQT percentages based on the top three teaching assignments submitted by each LEA. However, the data reported at this time represent preliminary data that will be corrected during the correction period in 2010.

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	17,706	16,639	94.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	29,829	29,378	98.5
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	39,549	34,974	88.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	102,023	99,453	97.5

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	50.7	16.6
Poverty metric used	For each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the POVERTY CODE field in the Student Snapshot template (# poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for elementary schools. Quartiles are numbered 1 through 4, with Quartile 1 being the "High Poverty" schools and Quartile 4 the "Low Poverty" schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	
Secondary schools	54.2	33.8
Poverty metric used	For each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the POVERTY CODE field in the Student Snapshot template (# poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for secondary schools. Quartiles are numbered 1 through 4, with Quartile 1 being the "High Poverty" schools and Quartile 4 the "Low Poverty" schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

through 5
(including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve
children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	English, Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	English
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Chinese, Russian, Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Chinese, Russian, Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined 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	47,726
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the underlined 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.	27,935
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	27,503
Uncoded languages	1,731
Chinese	1,703
Vietnamese	1,544
Arabic	1,239

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

PA will address Uncoded Languages, which is listed above as our #2 language, through additional professional developments to LEAs so students are identified in the correct language family so Pennsylvania's top five languages are identified correctly.

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	43,899
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,837
Total	47,736
Comments: The total number of LEP students tested is larger than the total number of LEP students because two different data sources were used. The longitudinal student database (PIMS) was used to obtain the number of LEP students. The assessment results file was used to determine the number of students who were assessed.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	12,013
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	25.2
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	26,411
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,561
Total	27,972
Comments: The total number of LEP students tested is less than the total number of Title III students because two different data sources were used. The longitudinal student database (PIMS) was used to obtain the number of LEP students. The assessment results file was used to determine the number of students who were assessed.	
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.	18,648

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 ôMaking Progressö 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 ôMaking Progressö and the number and**
   percent that met the State definition of ôAttainmentö of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	4,861	18.4	24,341	51.00
ELP attainment	7,506	28.4	7,637	16.00
Comments: The numbers reported for AMAOs are preliminary. PA is in the process of validating the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 AMAO data. PA will provide updated data to USDE by May 31, 2010.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
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)
Spanish
Comments: A translated version of the mathematics assessment is produced by the Commonwealth in Spanish (a side-by-side Spanish-English version). Qualified interpreters may provide a sight translation of the mathematics assessment into any other non-English language.

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)
Comments: Pennsylvania does not conduct native language assessments for reading/language arts.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments: A translated version of the science assessment is produced by the Commonwealth in Spanish (a side-by-side Spanish-English version). Qualified interpreters may provide a sight translation of the science assessment into any other non-English language.

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 underlined 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
2,226	1,299	3,525
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
1,280	995	77.7	285
Comments: Pennsylvania's annual mathematics assessment (PSSA) is administered to grades 3-8 and 11.			

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

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,280	876	68.4	404
Comments: Pennsylvania's annual reading/language arts assessment (PSSA) is administered to grades 3-8 and 11.			

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
494	294	59.5	200
Comments: Pennsylvania's annual science assessment (PSSA) is administered to grades 4, 8 and 11.			

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	119
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	74
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	85
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	118
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	35
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	19
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	
Comments: The numbers reported above for AMAOs are preliminary. PA is in the process of validating the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 AMAO data. PA will provide updated data to USDE by May 31. 2009.	

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 all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	Yes
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	4
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
13,290	7,284	45

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.

Pennsylvania's Data Collection System (PIMS) does not include a data indicator that identifies the number of Immigrant Children & Youth who participate in programs funded under Section 3114(d)(1). PA is adding this data element to its data collection system for 2010-2011.

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined 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) û The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course û (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.	10,186
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	482

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 <u>additional</u> teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do <u>not</u> include the number of teachers <u>currently</u> 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	89	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	82	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	76	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	55	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	57	
Other (Explain in comment box)	39	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	83	13,495
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	90	2,561
PD provided to principals	72	765
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	64	700
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	51	1,285
PD provided to community based organization personnel	28	475
Total	388	19,281

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

culturally responsive instructional practices inclusive of Pre-K students/ early childhood focus *training for interpreters for LEP students/situations *training for school district staff and community partners in the educational system of Mexico

6/24/09 ESL Essentials for Secondary Instructors: 3 hour workshop presented by secondary ESL department chair regarding ESL accommodations and instructional strategies. 18 in attendance

6/21/09 Curriculum Training for Middle School ESL teachers: 3 1 on 1 modeling for reg ed teachers, small group development of strategies and cross content expectations A consultant was hired to observe instruction and make recommendations. A staff development program was offered to the entire staff in

the identified elementary school. There was also a summer CPE workshop offered by the same consultant.

All K-12 ESL teachers did three modules of LETRS. These were modules 1, 2 and 3. All K-2 ESL teachers are being trained in a

comprehensive RTI initiative with in-depth training all year. All ESL teachers have the opportunity to attend workshops, conferences Brain

Development Bridging the Gap: How to support ELL's after they exit from ESL. Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students ---Overview

and strategies Celebrating cultural differences cultural awareness sessions to improve teacher/student rapport and understanding District

ESL personnel are involved with internal staff development efforts such as workshops for the Induction Program and content teachers that are not charged to the Title III budget. Diversity -Understanding Cultural/Ethnic Differences Vietnamese Culture Chocolate and Poverty Middle School Culture Day

ESL and Special Education: How to differentiate between a language barrier and a disability; how to assess ELL students for special

needs; understanding the development of second language proficiency and how this impacts students performance; best practice ESL

teachers and administration have been actively involved in implementing professional development for district teachers by providing a

curriculum that corresponds to the WIDA assessment. The ESL teachers have constructed this curriculum for K-8 in the ESL Video

conference: Neuroscience of Language -brain related to language learning Inclusive practices... What it should look like for ELLs.

Vocabulary Development... How to strategic teach new words.

LEP ... legal mandates and new BEC for ELLs Learning-Focused Strategies training addressed instruction for all students and creating

acquisition lessons for all students. Differentiated instruction and modifications for IEP and LEP students were addressed.

LEP teachers were in-serviced on methods for improving language acquisition through the use of technology.

LFS Training

Developing Assessment System

Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction/Advanced Diagnostic Assessment and Instructions

Instruction of on-line ESO graduate classes

Structured English Immersion

Foundations of Instruction for LEPs

Assessments

Literacy Development Strategies for ESL Staff

Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS)

Other:

Dual Language PD: strategies, TWI curriculum implementation and alignment to district curr/LFS/Rdg 1st, assessments,

Cultural characteristics and their impact on the language & scaffolding of curriculum for limited education/refugee students

Our administrators have received professional development dealing with program regulations regarding the servicing of ELLs, staffing, and

program models through Principals' Meetings and Internal Reviews.

Our ESL teachers participated in training for our core reading program because it has an ELL component.

Our professional development activities were not paid out of the ESL Title III funding however we did provide training through our regular

professional development funding.

Overview of the district's ESL program and services

Planning effective coordination of services is critical in assisting second language learners in obtaining English proficiency and high

academic achievement in core curriculum areas. Accomplishing this task involves several types of ongoing collaboration

Professional development related to instructional strategies for LEP students was provided for all K-12 teachers. In addition, the

participation of an ESL teacher in ESL courses offered at Montgomery County Intermediate Unit was paid for by the district.

Provide resources and support to parents

Standards Aligned System

Understanding Language Levels

State Requirements

System 44 and Read 180 training.

Technology training on the use of Rosetta Stone and TransAct.

Texts for a Spanish class for educators.

These activities were paid for through school district funding, not Title III funds.

Title III funds were used to pay district teachers to attend a 2 day summer professional development activity on ESL that was sponsored by

the Penn State Berks/Reading School District Title III National Professional Development grant. The cost of the con

Title III grant for the Upper St. Clair School District were approved on 10/15/09 so most professional development paid for by this grant will occur between Oct. 15, 2009 and Sept. 30, 2010 Title III grant implementation, use of TransAct, WIDA ACCESS training , LEP Data submission workshops

Training for Interpreters and Training for implementing the WAPT. Using technology for professional development of staff in order to

support English Language Learners We led a series of staff development experiences related to helping our teachers to better understand

the cultures of our ELLs and their

families. Several ELLs' parents collaborated with our ESL teachers to carry out the planning for these learning experiences.

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 <u>intended school year</u>. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/09	08/07/09	38
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.

PDE has moved the window for the data collection of LEP & Immigrant data to October 1, 2009 from a reporting window of March. This will allow PDE to meet federal reporting guidelines as well as validate data in a more timely manner.

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	20
Comments: Although last years total was 12, this number is correct. The criteria for determining whether a specific school building is persistently dangerous has not changed in Pennsylvania.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	82.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	77.0
Hispanic	71.7
White, non-Hispanic	92.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	82.5
Limited English proficient	73.0
Economically disadvantaged	78.5
Migratory students	69.2
Male	87.7
Female	90.8
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online 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	1.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3.7
Hispanic	4.4
White, non-Hispanic	1.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12.2
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	2.8
Migratory students	3.0
Male	2.0
Female	1.5
Comments: PDE does not collect the Limited English proficient dropout rate.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	8	8
Comments:		

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)		641
K		1,100
1		1,081
2		995
3		1,002
4		989
5		905
6		795
7		893
8		861
9		865
10		729
11		674
12		885
Ungraded		23
Total		12,438
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		6,053
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		5,300
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		338
Hotels/Motels		721
Total		12,412
Comments: There was a difference in the count of 26 less in the primary nighttime due to the data gathering process.		

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)	3,169
K	1,519
1	1,572
2	1,580
3	1,376
4	1,277
5	1,494
6	1,407
7	1,629
8	1,043
9	1,062
10	869
11	796
12	1,025
Ungraded	470
Total	20,288
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	695
Migratory children/youth	40
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,711
Limited English proficient students	485
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	7
Expedited evaluations	4
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	7
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Serving Learning project with University of Pittsburgh School of Pharmacy Clothing Assistance & Senior Expenses for Graduating students Emergency Assistance not listed above

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	8
School Selection	8
Transportation	8
School records	6
Immunizations	6
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	5

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Lack of Parental awareness of Rights Lack of Provider follow-through IEPs Students needing counseling & evaluations Lack of acceptance of definitions of homeless by district personnel Data collection process

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	332	159
4	304	145
5	264	107
6	275	107
7	251	122
8	253	158
High School	228	73
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	333	196
4	305	178
5	263	127
6	276	138
7	252	109
8	258	111
High School	232	57
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-ofschool youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the underlined 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)	789
K	281
1	289
2	314
3	294
4	228
5	263
6	233
7	223
8	216
9	215
10	214
11	182
12	107
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	1,479
Total	5,331
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> The Pennsylvania Department of Education Migrant Education Program (PDE MEP) experienced a roughly 12.7% drop in Category 1 Count due to lower ID&R results deriving from various factors including changes in migratory patterns, economic conditions, immigration issues and tighter interpretation of MEP eligibility regulations.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the underlined 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)	561
K	167
1	185
2	193
3	183
4	140
5	158
6	137
7	131
8	135
9	140
10	120
11	105
12	20
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	575
Total	2,952
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Despite the 12.7% decrease in Category 1 counts, PDE MEP experienced virtually no change in Category 2 Count due to greater efforts to make sure all children were provided summer services.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

After going through a rigorous quality control process, COE's are entered into the MIS2000 system by trained data specialists who provide another level of quality control, especially checking for duplication of students. Reports are generated and reviewed by Student Support Specialists and Recruiters to make sure the students match their records. Verification is also performed to make sure that students recruited in previous years are still residing in the state. It is required that a Needs Assessment is completed annually on every student and this is a method of verifying that they are still here. If a child is found to not be here any longer, that enrollment is totally removed from the system, resulting in that child no longer being counted on the reports. Reports are run that uniquely count a child only once, and only in a single (highest) grade for reporting these counts.

COE's are completed using face-to-face interviews by trained recruiters in accordance with the PA Dept of Education's Migrant Education Program Quality Control Manual. COE's are completed once upon initial recruitment or any time there is a new qualifying move. Recruiters or Student Support Specialists also annually complete a Needs Assessment on each child or youth as mentioned above as part of the annual verification that children or youth are still resident in the Commonwealth. These are also completed on a face-to-face basis. Recruiters, Student Support Specialists and Data Specialists are hired by our five Local Operation Agency subgrantees and all staff are required to attend four quarterly training sessions in their respective disciplines and our Annual State Conference as well as periodic webinars in order to maintain a consistent level of proficiency in skills aligned with current regulations and guidelines.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For nearly 15 years, PDE MEP has been using the same comprehensive high quality algorithm to count the students. In addition, many edit reports are created to verify that students who show on the count are truly eligible. For the 2008-09 count, the first thing the system checks is to make sure the Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) is on or after 9/1/05 and that Residency and QAD are before 8/31/09. ONLY students who meet all of the criteria of being a migrant student, including having a qualifying activity are included in the MIS2000 system. We also only count students who reached age 3 prior to 9/1/08 or if they reach age 3 between 9/1/08 and 8/31/09, they must still be residing in the state as of their third birthday. Reports are run on a regular basis and staff assigned to serve the children must verify that they are still resident. In addition, a Needs Assessment is required to be completed every year, and the child/youth must actually be encountered to complete this form. If a child turns age 22 prior 9/1/08 or before they are residing and enrolled in PA, they are excluded. If a child became a PA resident after 8/31/09 or left residency before 9/1/08 they are not counted. The general logic system of the reporting mechanism is designed to only count a student once per each child count category by assigning a single calculated grade per student and performing a distinct count by student.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Same As Category 1, except only counting those enrolled as receiving a summer service as documented using our Service Delivery Tracking. This was also compared to the enrollment as being indicated as a summer enrollment with a 100% match. The summer enrollment must also have started prior to reaching three years past their qualifying move or before reaching age 22 or before graduating or receiving a GED. Even if a student meeting any of these criteria is accidentally entered into the system as receiving a summer enrollment, the system would exclude them from the count. For students who turn age 3 between 9/1/08 and 8/31/09, the delivery of summer service must be after turning age 3 to count on the Category 2 report.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PDE MEP formal reinterview process is scheduled for the 2010 Fall. However despite that, our quality control process reviews 100% of the COE's as mentioned in the previous question. In addition, 20% of the COEs are re-verified by a state recruitment coordinator or auditor. In the past year absolutely none of those audited were found to be not eligible. All questionable cases were determined ineligible during initial Quality Control and never reached MIS2000. Of those 20% audited, NONE were determined to be ineligible.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are

inputted and updated accurately (and–for systems that merge data–consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Recruitment verification is monitored throughout the entire year. In addition, reports are generated throughout the year for support staff to compare that the children in the database are indeed those who they are serving/are resident. A state monitoring team annually visits each sub-grantee and makes random verification of eligibility as well. If at any time a student is determined not to be eligible, they are simply and totally deleted from the regional database, which in turn is deleted from the state database system. Regional and State staff also monitor summer programs via several methods, including attendance rosters and portfolio summary sheets. Written guidelines based on OME guidance are distributed to staff dealing with summer enrollments. These were reviewed at trainings and/or meetings held for staff involved
(e.g. Project Managers, Summer Teachers, Data Specialists). Lists are generated throughout the year and sent to the student support specialists who see the children on a regular basis. Any discrepancies between the lists and students actually enrolled in the program are noted and returned to the Data Specialist to make changes in the data system. Any changes made to the local database automatically propagate to the state database system. Periodically reports are run at the state and regional level and compared. If there are any discrepancies they are researched and corrected. State Office staff provide an annual monitoring audit to all sub-grantees. COE's and student records are randomly audited as part of this monitoring process. In addition, we continued with the process of recording specific summer services in the database. All students shown as having a summer enrollment were verified as having a documented summer service using this method as well. Throughout the enrollment process, trained Data Specialists ensure that students are not duplicated in the system at the regional or statewide level. If two enrolled students are determined to be the same student, they are merged into one single student. We also use MSIX's matching algorithm to make sure no students are duplicated. Reports are run periodically and especially immediately prior to the reporting of Category 1 and Category 2 counts that looks at students who have similar names and Birth Dates and then manually compared to see if they are in fact the same student. This is done regionally and statewide as well and if students are found to be the same, they are merged into one single student and as such only counted once on the final Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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