

**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 2009-10
DELAWARE**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 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 ED Facts 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part I, 2009-10	<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Delaware Department of Education		
Address: 401 Federal St. Dover, DE 19901		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Jeff Fleming		
Telephone: 302-735-4140		
Fax: 302-739-4221		
e-mail: jfleming@doe.k12.de.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lillian M. Lowery		
Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 10:00:47 AM		
Signature		Date

Certified with Approval of Dr. Lillian M. Lowery

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Delaware State Board of Education approved the adoption of national Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics on August 19, 2010. The adoption of the Common Core Standards compliments an array of reform efforts underway in Delaware schools aimed at better preparing students for college and career success.

Delaware's Department of Education (DDOE) launched a comprehensive review of academic offerings in classrooms across the state and proposed the incorporation of the Common Core Standards from kindergarten through 12th grade. Adoption of CCS is the first step to strengthen the existing curriculum known as the DE Prioritized Curriculum. The DDOE is working with school districts to train teachers to incorporate the new standards into their lessons.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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.

DDOE introduced the DCAS online adaptive assessments in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies beginning in Fall 2010, with three ELA/Math assessment windows this year, and spring Science and Social Studies assessments. Future years will offer option of a fourth assessment window in spring of each school year for students in ELA and Math. The Spring DCAS assessment is high stakes and will be used for AYP calculations and reporting.

DDOE will begin development of the DCAS Alternate Assessment for severely disabled students during the 2010-2011 school year. The DCAS Alternate Assessment is intended to replace the previous Delaware Alternate Portfolio Assessment (DAPA). Field testing and standard setting on the DCAS-Alt will occur in spring and summer 2011, with full operation beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. The DCAS-Alt is based on Academic Standard extensions tied to Delaware posted Academic Standards, including recently adopted Common Core Standards in ELA and Mathematics (Common Core Standards were adopted by the Delaware State Board of Education at their August 2010 monthly meeting).

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	70.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	30.0
Comments: These figures are based on dollar amounts that were spent on both development and administration of assessments. These percentages included federal funds that were representative of a series of prior year funding.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	No
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
Comments: These answers are based on our best information those questions related to English Language proficiency are still being researched and may need to be updated during the time of the open window in March.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	66,979		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	219		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,290		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	22,715		>97
Hispanic	7,309		>97
White, non-Hispanic	34,446		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,580		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,599		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	32,354		>97
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	34,307		>97
Female	32,672		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,076	32.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,631	59.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	800	8.4
Total	9,507	
Comments:		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	66,777		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	220		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,228		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	22,676		>97
Hispanic	7,232		>97
White, non-Hispanic	34,421		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,577		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,421		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	32,250		>97
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	34,210		>97
Female	32,567		>97
Comments:			

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

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,256	34.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,438	57.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	796	8.4
Total	9,490	
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	37,104		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	140		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,243		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	12,407		>97
Hispanic	3,849		>97
White, non-Hispanic	19,465		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,118		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,094		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	16,979		>97
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	18,862		>97
Female	18,242		>97
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	209	4.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,301	87.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	435	8.8
Total	4,945	
Comments:		

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	9,749	7,526	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	29	87.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	346	319	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,380	2,133	63.1
Hispanic	1,208	841	69.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,782	4,204	87.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,302	640	49.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	662	386	58.3
Economically disadvantaged students	5,103	3,464	67.9
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	5,012	3,918	78.2
Female	4,737	3,608	76.2

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

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	9,705	7,309	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	26	78.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	332	289	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,369	2,117	62.8
Hispanic	1,191	792	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	4,780	4,085	85.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,302	623	47.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	625	323	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,080	3,350	65.9
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,983	3,590	72.0
Female	4,722	3,719	78.8

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

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No students currently tested in this grade in Delaware			

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	9,670	7,494	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	36	24	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	355	331	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,289	2,131	64.8
Hispanic	1,190	844	70.9
White, non-Hispanic	4,800	4,164	86.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,321	556	42.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	455	245	53.8
Economically disadvantaged students	5,015	3,463	69.1
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,985	3,857	77.4
Female	4,685	3,637	77.6

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

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	9,628	7,171	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	36	29	80.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	346	313	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,280	2,040	62.2
Hispanic	1,170	757	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	4,796	4,032	84.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,319	519	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	419	169	40.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,991	3,249	65.1
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,971	3,542	71.3
Female	4,657	3,629	77.9

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

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	9,624	8,872	92.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	31	88.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	351	336	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,279	2,823	86.1
Hispanic	1,179	1,038	88.0
White, non-Hispanic	4,780	4,644	97.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,288	951	73.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	940	810	86.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,995	4,409	88.3
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,964	4,549	91.6
Female	4,660	4,323	92.8

Comments: American Indian/Alaskan Native - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Migratory Students - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate from year to year.

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	9,494	7,168	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	19	79.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	310	279	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,223	2,002	62.1
Hispanic	1,127	790	70.1
White, non-Hispanic	4,810	4,078	84.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,442	604	41.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	386	188	48.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,817	3,173	65.9
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,937	3,676	74.5
Female	4,557	3,492	76.6

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

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	9,454	7,502	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	20	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	294	266	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,219	2,193	68.1
Hispanic	1,112	823	74.0
White, non-Hispanic	4,805	4,200	87.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,439	630	43.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	349	143	41.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,792	3,373	70.4
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,915	3,727	75.8
Female	4,539	3,775	83.2

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

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No students tested with the state of Delaware in this grade.			

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	9,542	6,985	73.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	36	29	80.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	289	266	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,326	1,909	57.4
Hispanic	1,025	689	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	4,866	4,092	84.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,427	516	36.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	310	118	38.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,782	2,950	61.7
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,930	3,604	73.1
Female	4,612	3,381	73.3

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

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	9,508	6,939	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	36	27	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	285	258	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,322	2,045	61.6
Hispanic	1,008	644	63.9
White, non-Hispanic	4,857	3,965	81.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,428	473	33.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	287	77	26.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,763	2,953	62.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,912	3,356	68.3
Female	4,596	3,583	78.0

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

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	9,517	7,319	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	38	30	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	289	262	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,317	2,048	61.7
Hispanic	1,016	680	66.9
White, non-Hispanic	4,857	4,299	88.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,444	575	39.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	692	402	58.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,703	3,131	66.6
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,918	3,803	77.3
Female	4,599	3,516	76.5

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

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	9,406	6,571	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	20	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	327	287	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,179	1,717	54.0
Hispanic	965	594	61.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,911	3,953	80.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,438	442	30.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	297	91	30.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4,517	2,562	56.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	4,825	3,294	68.3
Female	4,581	3,277	71.5

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

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	9,365	7,686	82.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	22	91.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	318	295	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,168	2,300	72.6
Hispanic	951	728	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	4,904	4,341	88.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,433	634	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	274	115	42.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,494	3,274	72.9
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,808	3,710	77.2
Female	4,557	3,976	87.3

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

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No students test in this grade in Delaware for Science.			

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	9,553	6,503	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	23	71.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	297	265	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,165	1,594	50.4
Hispanic	988	606	61.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,071	4,015	79.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,381	439	31.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	282	103	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,417	2,399	54.3
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,809	3,265	67.9
Female	4,744	3,238	68.3

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

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	9,518	7,343	77.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	29	90.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	291	261	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,151	2,046	64.9
Hispanic	980	684	69.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,064	4,323	85.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,378	507	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	260	102	39.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,394	2,898	66.0
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,797	3,495	72.9
Female	4,721	3,848	81.5

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

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	9,466	5,633	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	20	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	301	240	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,117	1,208	38.8
Hispanic	988	435	44.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,029	3,730	74.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,354	329	24.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	289	31	10.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,335	1,848	42.6
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,747	2,770	58.4
Female	4,719	2,863	60.7

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

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	9,268	5,265	56.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	20	60.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	358	289	80.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,992	1,105	36.9
Hispanic	771	347	45.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,114	3,504	68.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,196	288	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	196	36	18.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,552	1,496	42.1
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,629	2,660	57.5
Female	4,639	2,605	56.2

Comments: Asian/Pacific Islander - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Economically Disadvantaged Students - There has been a larger number of students who fall into this category, because of the current state of the economy. Migratory Students - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same

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	9,211	5,888	63.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	26	78.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	277	78.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,968	1,439	48.5
Hispanic	760	373	49.1
White, non-Hispanic	5,097	3,773	74.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,191	277	23.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	178	17	9.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3,521	1,733	49.2
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	4,597	2,788	60.6
Female	4,614	3,100	67.2

Comments: Asian/Pacific Islander - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Limited English Proficient - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate greatly from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same individuals. Economically Disadvantaged Students - There has been a larger number of students who fall into this category, because of the current state of the economy. Migratory Students - There is a movement within the populations where we have small numbers and these can fluctuate from year to year. Proficiencies from year to year will change with these students as they may not be the same

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	7,926	4,536	57.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	17	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	199	68.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2,412	807	33.5
Hispanic	602	282	46.8
White, non-Hispanic	4,588	3,231	70.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	859	233	27.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	150	14	9.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,655	1,066	40.2
Migratory students	N<15	N<15	
Male	3,898	2,339	60.0
Female	4,028	2,197	54.5

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

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	199	80	40.2
Districts	22	1	4.5

Comments: The discrepancy in data from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 stems from two factors: First, CSPR is automatically pulling these numbers from EDEN specification N103. This specification is a Title III specification. As such, the definitions for what is considered a school and what is considered a district differs between Title III and Title I. Specifically, in Title I, charter schools are not considered for the purposes of Title I AYP determination. Not all schools receive Title III funding and as such would not be included in the N103 specification even though they receive a Title I accountability rating. Since we no longer have the ability to manually enter this information correctly in CSPR, our numbers are significantly different. Secondly, the Title I school and district accountability targets have risen between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. With the new targets, more schools have missed AYP than did in the previous year.

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 2009-10 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 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	121	5	41.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	115	4	39.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	6	5	83.3

Comments: The significant increase in the number of Title I schools is due to the fact that LEAs are choosing to serve a larger number of their eligible Title 1 schools, particularly at the secondary level. The significant drop in Title I schools that made AYP is due to the exponential increase each year in AYP targets. As a result fewer schools will be able to make AYP each year.

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
19		

Comments: Using EDEN specification N103 (Title III) as the basis for these (Title I) numbers has caused underreporting. There are 19 Title I school districts for the 2009-2010 school year. Of those, 2 districts made AYP for that year.

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	4
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
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.

Restructure the existing governance arrangements after analyzing current governance structure and decision-making lines of authority. Included in the new plan will be a combination of increased LEA direct governance and a possible restructuring into a school-within-a-school model.

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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 Delaware Department of Education's (DDOE) School Improvement Office, in coordination with the Title I and School Accountability offices, conducted three regional technical assistance sessions each quarter. The sessions were three hours each and included district administrative staff as well as key staff from schools under improvement, corrective action and restructuring. During the regional sessions, LEA school support teams were provided technical assistance on Title I and state level requirements of LEAs and schools under improvement, the basics of success planning, and an overview of how LEAs and schools can use project management to ensure plans and specific strategies are implemented with fidelity. Each session also focused on best practices in success planning and school improvement.

There were 19 districts and 16 Charter Schools operating in the State of Delaware during the 2009-2010 year. 15 Districts and 5 Charter Schools participated in the first quarterly session, 17 Districts and 5 Charter Schools participated in the second quarterly session, 17 Districts and 4 Charter Schools participated in the third quarterly session and 12 Districts and 4 Charter Schools participated in the fourth quarterly session.

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	

Comments: The one district in corrective action was required to implement the following corrective actions during SY 2009-10:
 1. Hire a district administrator for Special Education and Title I to provide additional supervision for Title I programs
 2. Reorganize the office of Special Education and Title I services to be part of the Instructional Division
 3. Hire an instructional specialist to work with classroom teachers to ensure low performing and special education students are receiving appropriate standards based instruction
 4. Use an inclusion model of special education in all schools
 5. Report progress on special education, African-American, and low-income student achievement to the department on a quarterly basis.

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 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	16	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	07/22/10
---	----------

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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2010.
 - 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 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
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 2009-10	7,485	7,541
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 2009-10	4,415	4,225
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 2009-10	59.0	56.0
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 2009-10	7,442	7,500
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 2009-10	4,727	4,864
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 2009-10	63.5	64.9
Comments:		

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	2
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	0

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	19
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 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

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 (strategies) was(were) used	Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), 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 (strategies) (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:						

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Delaware Department of Education's (DDOE) School Improvement Office, in coordination with the Title I and School Accountability offices, conducted three regional technical assistance sessions each quarter. The sessions were three hours each and included district administrative staff as well as key staff from schools under improvement, corrective action and restructuring. During the regional sessions, LEA school support teams were provided technical assistance on Title I and state level requirements of LEAs and schools under improvement, the basics of success planning, and an overview of how LEAs and schools can use project management to ensure plans and specific strategies are implemented with fidelity. Each session also focused on best practices in success planning and school improvement. There were 19 districts and 16 Charter Schools operating in the State of Delaware during the 2009-2010 year.

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 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Delaware did not reserve any Section 1003(g) funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance.

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 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Delaware Department of Education has an annual general fund appropriation that is provided on a formula basis to all schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. The funds are distributed to non-Title I schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring based on the level of improvement of the school. Title I schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring are each provided a base level appropriation from the state allocation. The funds are used by all schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring to address the achievement problems that caused the school to fall under improvement. The funds provided to Title I schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring are provided to complement the activities funded through the 1003(a) school improvement grants.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	12,996
Applied to transfer	116
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	116
Comments:	

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	\$ 206,033

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	1

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.

Comments:

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	4,368
Applied for supplemental educational services	575
Received supplemental educational services	575
Comments:	

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	\$ 1,162,633
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.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	20,274	19,205	94.7	1,069	5.3
All elementary classes	3,387	3,320	98.0	67	2.0
All secondary classes	16,887	15,885	94.1	1,002	5.9

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.

full-day self-contained classroom equals one class
--

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
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	31.3
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	11.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	46.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other reasons for Elementary classes not being taught by a Highly Qualified Teacher include the following:

- 1). Certification issues, such as: Certification mismatch with the class not having the speciality certificate (special ed, bilingual, esol, gifted and talented) required for the class; not holding full state certification
- 2). Teacher Quality Survey (Delaware's HQT data collection system) issues, such as: Survey rejected by the district/charter school; unfinished Survey; teacher did not take the survey; completed Survey was not verified by district/charter school staff.

	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)	53.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	26.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other reasons for Secondary classes not being taught by a Highly Qualified Teacher include the following:

- 1). Certification issues, such as: Certification mismatch with the class not having the speciality certificate (special ed, bilingual, esol, gifted and talented) required for the class; not holding full state certification
- 2). Teacher Quality Survey (Delaware's HQT data collection system) issues, such as: Survey rejected by the district/charter school; unfinished Survey; teacher did not take the survey; completed Survey was not verified by district/charter school staff.
- 3). Coding issues in the statewide pupil accounting system that is linked to the Survey, such as: no core academic subject specified; unique teacher identifier is missing.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	799	757	94.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	900	892	99.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,895	2,605	90.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	2,817	2,682	95.2
1.5.3.1 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.			

1.5.3.1 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	68.9	33.9
Poverty metric used	Free- reduced lunch participation	
Secondary schools	54.1	22.4
Poverty metric used	Free- reduced lunch participation	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	N/A
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	N/A
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: ESL-push in programs

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	7,028
---	-------

Comments:

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

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

#	
LEP	
students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	6,912

Comments:

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	5,444
Creoles and pidgins (Other)	336
Chinese	133
Arabic	94
Gujarati	87

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,729
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	249
Total	6,978
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,003
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP	20.4
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	6,622
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	236
Total	6,858
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. 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 students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	2,387

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	2,074	49.0	3,332	50.00
Attained proficiency	1,003	15.1	1,000	15.00
Comments:				

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.

Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

Language(s)
None

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:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
108	168	276
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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
109	79	72.5	30
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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
109	87	79.8	22
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
132	115	87.1	17
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	15
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	5
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	15
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	15
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	5
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met 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? No

If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.
Comments:

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,882	1,671	10

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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) ð The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course ð (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 as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	128
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	256

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	8	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	2	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	2	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	7	
Other (Explain in comment box)	8	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	10	1,544
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	210
PD provided to principals	9	163
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	8	83
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	8	137
PD provided to community based organization personnel	8	187
Total	50	2,324

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	08/01/09	30
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.

Due to state procedures for approving use of federal funds and steps involved for electronic distribution, at this time we cannot shorten the wait period for subgrantees to receive funds.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments:	

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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	85.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	88.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.9
Black, non-Hispanic	81.4
Hispanic	73.7
White, non-Hispanic	88.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	71.0
Limited English proficient	71.6
Economically disadvantaged	76.8
Migratory students	
Male	82.9
Female	87.7
Comments:	

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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4.9
Hispanic	4.8
White, non-Hispanic	3.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.1
Limited English proficient	6.3
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	
Male	5.8
Female	4.2
Comments: Data is correct as stated.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	7	7
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	19	19
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)	N<15
K	85	173
1	113	169
2	86	154
3	80	161
4	60	141
5	71	139
6	81	168
7	70	126
8	59	138
9	93	164
10	59	125
11	34	85
12	43	144
Ungraded	N<15	N<15
Total	944	1,899

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	181	808
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	655	937
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<15	N<15
Hotels/Motels	107	143
Total	944	1,899

Comments:

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<15
K	173
1	169
2	154
3	161
4	141
5	139
6	168
7	126
8	138
9	164
10	125
11	85
12	144
Ungraded	N<15
Total	1,899
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	84
Migratory children/youth	N<15
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	508
Limited English proficient students	118
Comments:	

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	1
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	0
Assistance with participation in school programs	11
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	11
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	10
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	11
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	11
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	111	71
4	111	75
5	97	57
6	108	57
7	96	56
8	99	57
High School	72	22
Comments:		

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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	114	70
4	114	68
5	99	54
6	108	54
7	99	40
8	98	47
High School	71	N<15
Comments:		

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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:

a. 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.

b. How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	23
K	N<15
1	N<15
2	N<15
3	N<15
4	N<15
5	N<15
6	N<15
7	N<15
8	N<15
9	N<15
10	N<15
11	N<15
12	N<15
Ungraded	N<15
Out-of-school	50
Total	150
Comments:	

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 2009-10 Category 1 numbers increased by 32% due to the following factors:

1. The state recruiter, now in her third year, was more experienced in locating/recruiting/qualifying eligible migrant students.
2. The SEA implemented a detailed Identification & Recruitment plan that generated more leads to potential migrant families.
3. Increased networking among agribusinesses and migrant employers provided more opportunities to contact families.
4. Consistent contact with existing migrant families to provide services created more positive interest in the migrant program and served to alert more migrant families.
5. The state recruiter had more familiarity with existing migrant camps and was able to canvass more effectively for incoming workers.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	N<15
K	N<15
1	N<15
2	N<15
3	N<15
4	N<15
5	N<15
6	N<15
7	N<15
8	N<15
9	N<15
10	N<15
11	N<15
12	N<15
Ungraded	N<15
Out-of-school	N<15
Total	45
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2009-10 Category 2 numbers decreased by only 1 student, which was less than 10% from the 2008-09 Category 2 numbers.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Delaware used the New Generation System data management program for Category 1 and 2 for the 2009-10 reporting period and for the previous reporting period in 2008-09.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data are collected through a practice standard in MEP programs. The recruiter conducts an interview with every family or individual enrolled in the MEP. It is during this time that a Certificate of Eligibility, COE, is completed and all data elements are collected. The minimum data elements are collected as required by regulation as well as information that will help place the child in the proper educational setting. This includes language needs, special education needs, homeless status, grades retained, low or failing grades, last grade completed, last school attended, and education interrupted. This collection occurs on a rolling basis throughout the year with the highest enrollment and data collection happening during the summer months.

Upon the initial collection and review of the data, the COE is passed to the data specialist who continues the process of quality control. The information is crosschecked for accuracy against DELSIS, NGS and MSIX. If any discrepancies are found between the information on the COE and previous enrollment records they are addressed at this time with the recruiter. Upon satisfaction that all information is correct the COE is passed on the state migrant director for review. If all information is "approved" the director signs the COE and returns it to the data specialist for entry into NGS.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state recruiter completes the COE through a personal interview with the migrant family and records the eligibility data. The COE is reviewed by the State Director and the State Data Specialist for eligibility determination, then entered into the New Generation System. The data for child counts is crosschecked for accuracy in DELSIS for K-12 students. Periodic NGS reports are produced during the academic year to determine migrant students enrolled and served in each term. This data in NGS is crosschecked with school lists to verify accuracy. Additionally, throughout the year the recruiter reports all changes in the students' status on the COE supplemental form and notifies the data entry person. The data entry person then updates the student's file in NGS. At the end of the summer programs in early to mid August academic and supplemental service information are turned into the data entry person to be entered into NGS.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 and Category 2 counts are collected in the same way.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Certificates of Eligibility for students enrolled in K-12 are verified against DELSIS for district, name, grade level, race/ethnicity, and date of birth. The state data specialist then enters the data into the New Generation System. Each student is only counted once even if the student has attended several schools during the reporting year. Summer program child counts are done using the time period that the summer school programs are in operation--July-August. All data is entered in NGS.

The recruiter supplies the information when a student is either pre-school age or is not currently attending school through face to face interviews with the family or out of school youth.

Delaware keeps a last qualifying move (LQM) date list. Both the migrant data entry person and the recruiter use the list to ensure only those migrant students who are currently eligible are counted. Delaware only counts 3 years olds and out of school youth whose last qualifying move date falls in the 3-year eligibility range. Students who are residents are confirmed by the recruiter through home visits, work visits, or telephone calls to the family or school personnel.

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

Delaware had two summer programs in 2009-10. The two summer programs were held after the close of the regular school year--July-August. The child count for category 2 is done by requesting a report from NGS for students enrolled for that time period and school codes for the two sites which held summer migrant programs. The two summer migrant programs turn in forms which include attendance, supplemental program assistance, a Family Services form that includes areas of health, child and adult education, assistance with transportation, housing, food etc; a Parent Involvement form and the High School and Out of School Youth Progress form.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 Count and the Category 2 Count are collected in the same way.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The first part of Delaware's quality control process is to ensure that our recruiter is well trained. The state recruiter attends national conferences when travel is permitted by the state. The second is to guarantee the accuracy of the Certificate of Eligibility, COE. After the state recruiter has completed a COE, the information is reviewed a second time and crosschecked in the NGS and DELSIS databases. This helps eliminate duplicates and provides the opportunity for any mistakes to be caught immediately. From there the data entry person reviews the COE again crosschecking the information in NGS, DELSIS and MSIX before passing it to the State Migrant Director for final review. If any discrepancies or questions arise in this process they are addressed with the recruiter and a follow up visit is conducted with the family. Upon the DMEP director's approval the information is entered into NGS.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Re-interviewing is a method of quality control that requires each new family and all individuals listed on a COE to be interviewed a second time by an interviewer who did not conduct the initial interview for the purposes of validating eligibility determinations. The process in Delaware is as follows:

1. As part of a student's initial enrollment paperwork a re-interview form is added to the file.
2. All local program staff that are conducting the re-interviews are trained by DDOE MEP staff on the eligibility requirements and re-interviewing.
3. The student file is transferred to the local programs who conduct the re-interview at a time of their convenience within one month of receiving the paperwork.
4. The re-interview is kept on file with the county program until the end of the summer session in which all paperwork is turned into the SEA.
5. For the students identified and recruited outside of the summer timeframe or those students who do not participate in the MEP summer programs, it will remain the responsibility of the county program staff of the county in which the students reside to conduct the re-interview.
6. Upon the completion of the re-interview and submission of the paperwork, the DMEP director reviews the paperwork and accepts the findings, negates the findings, or asks for additional evidence.
7. If the DMEP director negates the findings, the COE will be voided, and the children will be removed from the child count.

In the 2009-2010 school year Delaware had 59 new families/COEs that could have been part of the re-interview sample. Of those 59 families 20 were re-interviewed. Of the 20 families re-interviewed all were found to be eligible.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year migrant students are recruited and enrolled and school lists are updated. Students are checked in DELSIS to verify that the migrant students are in the correct schools. Then school lists are requested from NGS and comparisons are made to make sure the information is the same. In addition the state recruiter and data entry person work together as a system of checks and balances to ensure all data is maintained accurately on a monthly basis. The State MEP Director reviews the reports and maintains communication with both the recruiter and data specialist for continuous quality control.

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.

At the conclusion of Delaware's two summer schools in August, the data entry person takes the state's final steps to ensure accuracy by manually checking the data. In September, the recruiter reviews all COEs to verify that students are eligible. All factors related to eligibility are reviewed: residency, age (turning 3 or turning 22), and remaining years of eligibility. A combination of using DELSIS, NGS, and MSIX with home visits ensures accuracy in reporting.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As of December 2010, Delaware is in the process of developing a MEP Resource Guide and revised state Identification & Recruitment manual for additional recruitment efforts.

While the results of the re-interviewing process were favorable for the state, the SEA identified two areas of improvement for future prospective re-interviewing. A) The SEA will improve the training it provides to the LEA staff that conducts the re-interviews. B) The SEA will ensure the process and deadline are clearly understood by the local directors. With these two improvements the few technical problems that were experienced this year will resolve themselves.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Delaware has no concerns related to the child counts submitted.